

Mr. FESS. Oh, no; I have not it. I have simply the range of the value of the greenback dollar.

Mr. NORRIS. I asked the Senator that question, and I thought he answered it in the affirmative.

Mr. FESS. I misunderstood the Senator.

Mr. NORRIS. If the Senator has not anything else there, I will withdraw my objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Ohio? The Chair hears none.

The matter referred to is as follows:

Table showing the average value in gold of \$100 in currency in the New York market, by months, from Jan. 1, 1862, to Dec. 31, 1878, both inclusive

Periods	1862	1863	1864	1865	1866	1867	1868	1869	1870	1871	1872	1873	1874	1875	1876	1877	1878
January	97.6	68.9	64.3	46.3	71.4	74.3	72.2	73.7	82.4	90.3	91.7	88.7	89.7	88.9	88.6	94.0	97.9
February	96.6	62.3	63.1	48.7	72.3	72.8	70.7	74.4	83.7	89.7	90.7	87.6	89.1	87.3	88.2	94.8	98.0
March	98.2	64.7	61.4	57.5	76.6	74.1	71.7	76.2	88.8	90.1	90.8	86.6	89.2	86.6	87.5	91.4	98.8
April	98.5	66.0	57.9	67.3	78.6	73.7	72.1	75.2	88.4	90.4	90.0	84.9	88.2	87.1	88.5	94.2	99.4
May	96.8	67.2	56.7	73.7	75.9	73.0	71.6	71.8	87.2	89.7	88.0	85.0	89.9	86.3	88.8	93.5	99.3
June	93.9	69.2	47.5	71.4	67.2	72.7	71.4	72.4	88.6	89.0	87.8	85.8	90.0	85.4	88.9	94.9	99.2
July	86.6	76.6	38.7	70.4	66.0	71.7	70.1	73.5	85.6	89.0	87.5	86.4	91.0	87.2	89.4	94.8	99.5
August	87.3	79.5	39.4	69.7	67.2	71.0	68.7	74.5	84.8	89.0	87.4	86.7	91.2	88.1	89.9	95.2	99.5
September	84.4	74.5	44.9	69.5	68.7	69.7	69.6	73.1	87.1	87.3	88.1	88.7	91.2	86.4	90.9	96.8	99.6
October	77.8	67.7	48.3	68.7	67.4	69.7	72.9	76.8	88.7	88.3	88.3	91.8	91.0	85.9	91.2	97.3	99.5
November	76.3	67.6	42.8	68.0	69.5	71.6	74.4	79.2	89.8	89.9	88.6	92.1	90.2	87.2	91.7	97.3	99.8
December	75.6	66.2	44.0	68.4	73.2	74.2	74.0	82.3	90.3	91.5	89.1	90.9	89.6	87.8	92.6	97.3	99.9

RECESS

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Arkansas.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, March 31, 1933, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 30 (legislative day of Mar. 13), 1933

FOREIGN SERVICE

SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE

Robert G. McGregor, Jr. George M. Graves.
Peter H. A. Flood. Robert Lacy Smyth.

CONSUL GENERALS

Harold B. Quarton.
Ernest L. Ives.

MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL RADIO COMMISSION

James H. Hanley to be a member of the Federal Radio Commission.

MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

C. B. Merriam to be a member of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board.

GOVERNOR OF ALASKA

John W. Troy to be Governor of Alaska.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MARCH 30, 1933

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Reverend Clifford H. Jope, pastor, Ninth Street Christian Church, offered the following prayer:

Gracious Father, we are thankful for that sense which drives us to seek Thy favor in every important undertaking. Today, at the opening of significant deliberation in this Chamber, we implore Thy divine leadership, as unmistakable and definite as "the pillar of cloud by day and the pillar of fire by night." May Thy presence be our guide, giving us inward calm, when we are to tread in an unfamiliar road. Give us holy courage, that we may not be daunted by any foe or turn aside from our appointed task. May we find our delight in such things as please Thee. Keep us from excess of fear, doubt, and love of self; and by Thy love and pardon let us abide in peace. May Thy choicest favor rest upon the executive, legislative, and judicial leaders of this Nation and all those who labor for the people's highest good. Keep us every day till Thou shalt keep us evermore. In the Master's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

PERMISSION OF COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY TO SIT DURING THE SESSION OF THE HOUSE

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary may have permission to sit today during the session of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS]?

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO COMMITTEES

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H.Res. 87) and ask for its consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

House Resolution 87

Resolved, That CHARLES M. BAKEWELL, of Connecticut, be, and is hereby, elected a member of the standing Committee on Education of the House of Representatives.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H.Res. 88) and ask its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 88

Resolved, That the following Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following standing committees of the House of Representatives, to wit:

Foreign Affairs: MARTIN A. BRENNAN, Illinois; LAWRENCE E. IMHOFF, Ohio.

Agriculture: SANTIAGO IGLESIAS, Puerto Rico.

Insular Affairs: WILLIAM H. LARRABEE, Indiana; SANTIAGO IGLESIAS, Puerto Rico.

Education: KATHRYN O'LOUGHLIN MCCARTHY, Kansas; FRANK GILLESPIE, Illinois.

District of Columbia: THEO. B. WERNER, South Dakota; JAMES G. SCRUGHAM, Nevada.

Roads: FRANK GILLESPIE, Illinois.

The resolution was agreed to.

GRAIN, STRAW, ETC., AS SUBSTITUTE FOR MOTOR FUEL

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes, not to make a speech, but to present a resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. ADAMS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time to present a resolution passed by the State of Delaware, which embraces the district which I have the honor to represent. The resolution is as follows:

Whereas science has recently developed a process by which grain, straw, and other similar agricultural products may be utilized to produce a substitute or ingredient for a motor fuel; and

Whereas if such process is given wide-spread use it will tend to alleviate in measure the distress which is prevalent at the present time with our farmers, inasmuch as our farmers will be able to dispose of their excess and surplus crops thereby, all of which will help to give the agricultural sections greater purchasing power, and thereby help to end the depression; and

Whereas it appears that the problem is one of national scope and one that properly belongs in the jurisdiction of the National Congress: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Delaware in General Assembly met, That the National Congress

be, and it is hereby memorialized to give such aid and impetus as is necessary and fitting to promote the use of the process which utilizes the grain, straw, and other agricultural products in producing a substitute or ingredient for gasoline or motor fuel.

MEDICINAL LIQUORS

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up the resolution (H.Res. 86) and ask its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 86

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of S. 562, an act relating to the prescribing of medicinal liquors.

That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and the amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, this rule that is called up is certainly in the hands of its friends. All of the 1 hour of time on the rule is controlled by the strong wet advocates of this bill. That is not a fair division of time.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yielded for a question but not for a statement.

Mr. BLANTON. I want to ask my friend if he does not think under those circumstances at least one half of the time for general debate that is to be devoted to this bill in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union should be controlled by somebody who is against it?

Mr. SABATH. I have no objection, if the opposition desires to utilize half of the time.

Mr. BLANTON. Will not the gentlemen have the rule changed so that the time in opposition to the bill shall be controlled by those who are against the bill and not by those who are for it?

Mr. SABATH. I feel there will be no objection on the part of the gentleman on the other side to yielding to those who are opposed to the bill.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, but there ought to be an equal division of time controlled by those who are opposed to the bill, to be yielded at will to opponents of the bill, under the fair rules of debate. I want to go along with the gentleman, as far as I can consistently, to expedite the time of the House. I know there is no reason on earth why any of us who oppose this bill should think we could stop the passage of this whisky measure, but those of us who are against it, who are unalterably opposed to putting the Government into the liquor business, want to be heard before doctors and drug stores are allowed to furnish whisky in unlimited quantities to everybody who is financially able to pay cash for it.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the regular order.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, the gentleman from New York cannot rush things by calling for the regular order. We must have an understanding. Will the gentleman from Chicago see that I get some time?

Mr. SABATH. I will see that the gentleman gets such reasonable time as he may desire.

Mr. BLANTON. That is all I ask.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman from Texas tell us how much time he wants?

Mr. BLANTON. I desire 10 minutes on the rule.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I will give the gentleman from Texas 10 minutes on the rule.

Mr. SABATH. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts desire some time on the rule?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. All the time we require on the rule is enough to satisfy the needs of the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BLANTON. I want 10 minutes on this rule. Before doctors are authorized by this bill to sell unlimited prescriptions for whisky at \$3 per, and before drug stores are allowed

to sell whisky at \$4 per pint in unlimited quantities, I want time to register my protest against it.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I myself do not desire to take up much time. This is a liberal rule, something unusual for these times, unlike some of the other rules we have been obliged to bring in.

This bill makes in order Senate bill 562, which was unanimously passed by that body yesterday, and which is identical to the bill passed by the House in the last session of Congress.

This rule permits the bill to be taken up under the 5-minute rule, and 30 minutes a side is allowed for general debate. While the bill is being taken up under the 5-minute rule, those Members desiring to offer amendments will have the opportunity to do so. Members have complained bitterly that heretofore they have had no opportunity to offer amendments. This rule permits amendment.

As I stated, this bill was unanimously passed by the Senate and passed by the House in the last session by a tremendous vote.

This bill is intended to accomplish three purposes:

First. To enable a person in need of liquor because of disease, injury, or other disability, to obtain it in such quantities as are medically indicated.

Second. To insure to patients for whom medicinal liquor is needed secrecy concerning the ailments from which they suffer.

Third. To simplify prescribing, thereby saving approximately \$110,000 a year to the Government.

The ends named are to be accomplished without weakening the control of medicinal liquor by the Government.

To enable patients to obtain necessary medicinal liquor the bill proposes to strike out of the National Prohibition Act as supplemented and amended all statutory limits on the quantity of liquor that may be prescribed and the number of prescriptions that may be issued, and to insert in lieu thereof, "no more liquor shall be prescribed to any person than is necessary to supply his medicinal needs."

An estimated saving of approximately \$110,000 a year is to be effected by discontinuing the use of the present official prescription blanks, which cost the Government about \$125,000 a year, and substituting for them stamps, to be used in authenticating physicians' lawful prescriptions, which will cost the Government from \$10,000 to \$15,000 a year.

With the exception of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] I do not know of anyone who is opposed to it. Therefore, I shall not take up the time of the House, especially since the day is so beautiful and since some of the Members have very important appointments out of doors. I feel that after these days of struggle and strife they are entitled to a little rest and to an opportunity to inhale some of the invigorating air.

I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] the 10 minutes that have been agreed upon by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Horne, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 562. An act relating to the prescribing of medicinal liquors.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, this message from the Senate has just brought over the bill from the other end of the Capitol.

Mr. SABATH. That is the reason I took up the time.

Mr. BLANTON. Under a special rule from the Rules Committee we are to take up a bill—in fact, we already had taken up a bill—that had not yet been messaged over from the Senate. That is some speed for our wet friends. This bill passed the Senate yesterday without even the floor leader knowing what was going on. It was called up by consent and passed without debate in the twinkling of an eye. After it had passed, the floor leader demanded that someone

should make a brief explanation of the bill, and he was informed that the bill had already passed. No such bill is going to pass this House without the people's knowing about it.

We have a rule here under which all the time on the rule is controlled by those in favor of this bill, and if it were not for the generous courtesy of my good friend from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], whom, in spite of his wet ideas, all of us drys love, if it were not for his kindness we would not have any time.

Under the rule all the time on our Democratic side is to be controlled by our friend from New York [Mr. CELLER], who is sponsoring the bill. Not a dry can yield 1 minute of time on this rule to a dry; not one. Is this fair?

Mr. BOYLAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield.

Mr. BOYLAN. The gentleman has his time. What is he hollering about?

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, well, I want fairness. I want an equitable division of time in debate.

I want fairness in the great House of Representatives. There should always in debate here be a fair division of time.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Does not the gentleman know that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KURTZ], who is to control the time on our side, is a dry?

Mr. BLANTON. Certainly he is, and with it he is a splendid gentleman; but he has no time on this rule.

There ought to be somebody here to oppose the bill in charge of half the time on this rule on the dry side who has half of the time to yield.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Just one minute; I want to use myself what little time the gentleman so generously gave me.

This is not a question of alcoholic content over which there might be some scientific diversity of opinion. This is a question of hard liquor. This is a question of rye whisky. This is a question of liquor about the intoxicating effect of which there is no controversy. This is about liquor that will intoxicate, and you are providing that it can be handed out in drug stores by wet doctors in every dry State of this Union. There is not a single dry State in this Union that is protected under this bill. There has been a terrible scandal in the States already under the old law.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Does the gentleman think he is accurate in stating this bill will give unrestricted power to physicians to issue prescriptions in dry States?

Mr. BLANTON. Why will it not do just that?

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to permit me to answer his question?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. CELLER. The States have a perfect right to pass their own enactments precluding the issuance of prescriptions. More than 12 States now preclude them.

Mr. BLANTON. It is ridiculous to say that we will pass a bill that will put liquor in every single corner of every dry State, and then let the Government force the people of the States to the extra expense of calling the legislatures into session to pass laws to stop the effects of such a bill. We ought to protect them in this bill.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I am afraid I cannot yield.

Mr. O'CONNOR. We will get the gentleman some more time.

Mr. BLANTON. Get me 10 minutes more and I will answer every question you wet Members want to ask me. Get me 3 minutes more and I will yield. Otherwise, I want to use my own time.

I want to ask you this: Are you in favor of nullifying the Constitution?

Under the old law, even in my own dry State, physicians have signed prescriptions in blank and left them in drug stores and men have gone there and gotten them without

even seeing a physician simply by paying \$3 for the prescription and \$3 to \$4 for the pint of whisky. It has been a scandal. This has been true in many of the dry States in this Nation; and you know what will happen under this bill. Prescriptions will be granted to the sons of the idle rich; they will get their whisky whenever they want it, having the money to pay for it. They will pay their doctor \$3 a prescription and they will pay \$4 and \$5 a pint for it at the drug stores; they will stick it in their hip pockets and have it at every social function in the United States, and you know it. Why do you want to pass this bill?

Mr. KNUTSON. It only costs \$2.

Mr. BLANTON. It sells higher than \$2 in certain portions of the country.

Mr. KNUTSON. In Minnesota it is only \$2.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, everything is cheap in Minnesota. [Laughter.]

Mr. McFARLANE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield to my friend.

Mr. McFARLANE. Dr. Rosser, past president of the State Medical Association of Texas, in January of this year in substance made the statement before a large gathering of people in Dallas that liquor is not necessary in the treatment of any of the human ailments.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, but you cannot make our thirsty friends here in the House admit that. What would Dr. O'CONNOR do if he were prescribing and the thirsty were to go to him for liquor? He would prescribe a dozen bottles every few hours. What would Dr. SABATH do? You could get all the liquor you wanted from Dr. SABATH. You could get every single pint of liquor you wanted from Dr. CELLER. They would not hesitate to let you have barrels of it if you needed it. And if you were thirsty, they would say you needed it.

Mr. SABATH. What about Dr. SIROVICH?

Mr. BLANTON. Dr. SIROVICH would bathe you in it. He would feed it to the American babies instead of milk.

Mr. SIROVICH. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BLANTON. Certainly.

Mr. SIROVICH. I want to tell my distinguished friend that while I have been a physician for 25 years, since the prohibition law went into effect—

Mr. BLANTON. Look out; you are going to make a dangerous admission.

Mr. SIROVICH. While I have the right to fill out 100 prescriptions every month, as has every physician in the United States, I never gave one in my life, and the records of the Prohibition Department will show that Dr. SIROVICH's name has never appeared once on any liquor prescription.

Mr. BLANTON. That proves my statement that it is not necessary. [Laughter and applause.] You are passing a bill here that is absolutely unnecessary except to nullify the Constitution. I showed this by the statement of our good friend from Washington, Dr. Summers.

Mr. SIROVICH. The gentleman made the statement—

Mr. BLANTON. I do not yield further. I am not going to let you capitulate on your statement.

Dr. Summers, who served here for years, stated when this bill was up before that he had been a physician and had medals from lots of hospitals and from foreign countries, that he did not believe it was necessary for a physician to prescribe liquor. I had another doctor get up here and make the statement that it is not necessary.

We all know it is not necessary, but this is a bill to nullify the Constitution and make it easy for people who have the money to get hard liquor in every State in the Nation. You wets had better look out. You who want to repeal the eighteenth amendment are going to make conditions so bad and indecent that you are going to find out that the American people are going to rise up in their might and tell you that "you cannot pass", and they will refuse to repeal the eighteenth amendment. When they do change, they will force you to repeal this iniquitous law that puts plenty of hard liquor in every dry State of the Nation for all who can pay for it. [Applause.]

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SIROVICH].

Mr. SIROVICH. Mr. Speaker, when I interrogated my dear friend, TOM BLANTON, I wanted to call his attention to the fact that since prohibition has gone into effect I have been doing surgical work. As a surgeon it was absolutely unnecessary for me to prescribe liquor for patients before going upon the operating table. That is why I have never prescribed liquor to any patient entrusted to my care. The records in the Prohibition Department will confirm my statement. However, most of the physicians of our country have used medicinal alcohol in the form of cognac, whisky, brandy, wine, and champagne to bridge over the distressing period of infectious and contagious diseases and during the period of convalescence.

Alcohol should only be used in an emergency. It should be a temporary remedy, used in crisis in pneumonia and in other infectious diseases to stimulate the heart, or occasionally to be utilized as a sedative to induce sleep. The heart reacts quickly and effectively and responds at once to the use of medicinal alcohol.

In the past alcohol was used mainly in the treatment of acute infections. In such infections large amounts of alcohol could be tolerated without becoming intoxicated. In these infectious diseases alcohol acted as a food, tending to spare the tissues of the body. It permitted the retention of fluids in the body, a matter of great importance in fevers, particularly because the loss of water through perspiration is great and serious under these conditions. Under such conditions, when the patient is suffering from an infectious disease, the utilization of alcohol creates a feeling of artificial well-being. Alcohol judiciously given in small doses under such conditions is more beneficial to the patient than the ingestion of opiates, which depress him more.

Alcohol in moderate doses in pneumonia, influenza, typhoid fever stimulates the respiration, dilates the blood vessels, and helps to modify the circulation.

The great virtue of using alcohol during the period of convalescence, or during the height of acute infectious and contagious diseases, is the fact that alcohol is burned in the body and thus serves as a great source of energy. Its chief utilization under such conditions is not only as a medicine but as a food. Its value consists in the fact that it is not nitrogenous. It cannot replace protein substances that are broken down in the body, but it acts as a substitute for some of the carbohydrates or starches in the body. Medicinal alcohol has also been used in the treatment of diabetes. Professor Duclaux, of the Pasteur Institute of France, was so greatly impressed with the evidence on this question that he boldly asserted that alcohol as a medicine, and particularly as a food, surpasses starch and sugar in value, since weight for weight it contains more energy and heat. As a matter of fact, alcohol is completely oxidized in the stomach, absorbed in the tissues, immediately creates heat and energy and leaves no refuse behind, with the exception of carbon dioxide and water.

When alcohol is taken in moderation, Professor Dixon contends no injurious effects could be proven. The people who create the great alcohol problem of our country are heavy drinkers. They constitute the psychopathic constitutional inferior group. The reason they drink so much medicinal alcohol is to help them feel like normal human beings.

The American Medical Association of the United States has repeatedly contended that alcohol is helpful in the treatment of disease and is being used by some of the greatest men in our profession.

Mr. Speaker, ladies, and gentlemen, at a meeting of the Medical Society of New York our affable and distinguished Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, Dr. Hugh Cumming, in discussing the treatment of influenza, after I had introduced him to the membership of that society, said that one of the most important drugs that could be utilized to relieve the victims of this influenza condition was none other than medicinal alcohol. No one, therefore, will deny that medicinal alcohol, when used in

moderation as a drink, medicine, and food, has been instrumental in preserving the lives of thousands of people who have had the privilege of using it. [Applause.]

The Copeland-Celler bill should be passed immediately, as it will bring back to the medical profession the rights, privileges, and prerogatives of the doctor, which he should never have been deprived of through legislation in the past. [Applause.]

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin, Dr. HENNEY.

Mr. HENNEY. Mr. Speaker and my fellow colleagues, I should be recreant in the loyalty that I owe to my medical confreres throughout the United States were I not to add my voice in approval of this bill. The American Medical Association, representing as it does the most scientific group of men in the medical profession and voicing the highest ideals of that profession in exactly the same manner as the American Federation of Labor, went on record years ago against the Volstead Act. As I have stated, our best intellects, our most scientific, cultured, and ethical physicians and surgeons, are members, and the leaders of the American Medical Association, and, if I may digress, if I may be pardoned for group praise, for community adulation, I should say that practically every advance that has been made and every scientific life-saving discovery that has been advanced has come from the regular medical profession represented in the country by the American Medical Association. I need only mention the control of diphtheria, scarlet fever, small-pox, typhoid fever, yellow fever, tetanus or lockjaw, spinal meningitis, infantile paralysis, pernicious anemia, diabetes, Asiatic cholera, leprosy, and scores of other devastating diseases, most of which but a few short years ago were simply treated by physicians, handled by the incantations of the religious, and, as a matter of finality, they were given transportation by the kindly sexton to that uncertain and uncherished great beyond. Today it is different, thanks to the scientists, many of whom have lost their lives from the very diseases that they were investigating in order that others might live.

I have prefaced my remarks in this way in order to show "what manner of men they were."

The group of educated men, skilled as they are in the pathology and diagnosis of diseases and trained by long experience and experimental study in the application of serums, drugs, and remedies in the treatment of maladies, are the best equipped and the only ones authoritatively capable of passing upon the efficacy or worthiness of such remedies. Certainly it is not the janitor, the minister, the professional reformer, nor Mother Grundy who shall set himself up as the court of last appeals in the modus operandi of the humble physician. As early as 1922 the American Medical Association, through a resolution by the house of delegates at the St. Louis convention, went on record as being opposed to the Volstead law. They were the best equipped and in the best position of any group of men, professional or otherwise, to pass sober judgment on this experiment. Insofar as I know, they were the only large group of professional men for several years who fearlessly so expressed themselves. In the July 1922 issues of the Journal of the American Medical Association it was stated:

The vote of the house of delegates is interesting as an exhibit of professional opinion, but points out that Congress is its own medical authority, just as it is its own economic and financial authority. It has ordered, in effect, that whisky is not necessary in medical practice, and, having rejected the testimony of the doctors as incompetent, it is immaterial how large a percentage of practicing physicians regard the use of whisky as beneficial.

On April 30, 1922, Dr. Lambert, dean emeritus of Columbia University, New York City, who had won a case in the lower courts of New York as to the constitutionality of the Volstead Act, defended his case in the Supreme Court. The American Medical Association filed a brief on the one hand in behalf of Dr. Lambert and the Anti-Saloon League on the other filed one against him. The case was finally decided, upholding the constitutionality of the Volstead Act by a vote of 5 to 4.

Beginning in January 1922, the American Medical Association, being aware of the fact that they would be accused of being partisan and of having ulterior motives in the matter, and being cognizant that the argument would be used against them that the leaders were the hierarchy of the organization and in nowise represented the medical "hoi polloi", set about to conduct a referendum of the physicians of the entire United States. To be absolutely fair, they decided to send questionnaires to every alternate subscriber to the Journal throughout the United States. In the villages where there was but one physician he was sent a blank, and if there were two the one whose name ranked nearest to the "A" end of the alphabet was sent this questionnaire. Besides these there were sent out 10,000 questionnaires to the physicians who were not members of the American Medical Association. The following questions in substance were asked:

- (1) Do you believe that whisky is necessary in the treatment of disease?
- (2) Do you believe that wine is necessary in the treatment of disease?
- (3) Do you believe that beer is necessary in the treatment of disease?
- (4) Have you had any patients die or suffer harmful results because of the lack of liquors, wine, or beer in the treatment of disease?
- (5) Do you hold a permit to prescribe or dispense liquors?
- (6) What is your opinion of the Volstead law?

About 58 percent of the physicians answered the questionnaire, which is a very large return on such a referendum, and the percentage of answers was practically the same from all sections of the United States—North, East, South, and West—and I might add that the percentages of "no" and "yes" from the several sections held very much the same relation on all of these questions.

Mind you, this was early in 1922, when people were still worshipping at the shrine of Volsteadian idealism, and the psychological reaction against this quintessence of congressional folly had not as yet begun to assert itself; still at that time nearly 50 percent of the physicians of the country were partial to liquor as a necessary remedy in therapeutics. About 33½ percent answered "yes" for wine, and about 25 percent were in favor of beer as a remedial agent. About 50 percent of those who answered had not made application for permits to dispense or prescribe liquors. About 5 percent stated that patients had suffered or died because of the need for alcoholic stimulants, and many of them who, in replying to the question asking for their opinion of the Volstead law, stated that there was absolutely no need for liquor or any other alcoholic beverage and that all diseases were better treated in some other way, there were an equal number of others who were honest, we must assume, in their praises of the merits of whisky and other alcoholic liquors in medicine. Comments were made at that time of the observations of a large number of physicians from Iowa, Kansas, Nebraska, Maine, and other traditionally dry States, who stated that law observance was breaking down and that young people were becoming addicted to the use of intoxicants.

Again in June 1923 the house of delegates condemned the Volstead Act and passed a resolution requesting Congress to remove the restrictions on physicians' prescriptions, and again on June 24, 1924, the house of delegates of the American Medical Association went on record thus, adopting a resolution calling for repeal of certain sections of the Prohibition Act, as they might interfere with the proper relation existing between physician and patient. Each year since 1922 the association has gone on record and memorialized the higher-ups to repeal the Volstead Act, and particularly that part of it in which the Prohibition Bureau sets itself up with Esculapian erudition, telling the lowly physician how much, how often, where, and when he may be permitted to prescribe a drug, to apply a remedy, that he, or at least a large percentage of physicians, has believed to be a necessary adjunct to his therapeutic armamentarium.

The stimulating effect of a small dose of whisky does not last over 1 or 2 hours, as it is promptly excreted. If 2 teaspoonfuls, which is a small dose, as used in pneumonia or flu were dispensed every hour, it would be equal to 1 ounce every 4 hours, or 6 ounces per day. The pint of 16 ounces allowed by Dr. Volstead would be entirely used up in 3 days and 2 ounces extra shall have to be borrowed from the hired man's "hipper". Every physician will admit that if liquor has any beneficial result it must be used this way, and also that this dose is small. Then, again, other cases would not require more than a pint of liquor in 3 weeks, namely, senile patients with weak hearts.

The placing of this restriction, the attempting to apply their therapeutic yardstick to all cases is an illogical and unreasonable restriction. It is an injustice to the conscientious and honest physician. If a remedy has value, a physician should be allowed to use his judgment as to why, when, where, and how it should be administered. If you employ him as your physician, no doubt you think you need him, and you have confidence in him. Why, then, the silly limitations as to what drug and how much you should allow him to administer? Better consult Gunn's family doctorbook and take Lydia Pinkham's universal remedy, or the famed cough drops with the whiskers. I am for this bill and I hope it passes this House. [Applause.]

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill S. 562, an act relating to the prescribing of medicinal liquors.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is now in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of a bill, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 562

An act relating to the prescribing of medicinal liquors

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) the third sentence of section 7 of title II of the National Prohibition Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows: "no more liquor shall be prescribed to any person than is necessary to supply his medicinal needs, and no prescription shall be refilled. No person shall by any statement or representation that he knows is false, or could by reasonable diligence ascertain to be false, induce any physician to prescribe liquor for medicinal use (1) when there is no medicinal need for such liquor or (2) in excess of the amount of medicinal liquor needed."

(b) Section 7 of title II of such act, as amended, is further amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a semicolon and the following: "but no physician shall be called upon to file any statement of such ailment in the Department of Justice or the Department of the Treasury or in any other office of the Government, or to keep his records in such a way as to lead to the disclosure of any such ailment, except as he may be lawfully required (1) to make such disclosure in any court in the course of a hearing under authority of section 9, title II, of this act, or (2) to make such disclosure to any duly qualified person engaged in the execution or enforcement of this act or any act supplementary hereto."

Sec. 2. Strike out section 8 of title II of the National Prohibition Act, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Sec. 8. The Commissioner shall cause stamps to be printed, the design of which shall be prescribed by regulations in accordance with the provisions of this act, and he shall furnish the same free of cost to physicians holding permits to prescribe. Each such physician shall affix one of said stamps to each such prescription written by him and shall cancel same under regulations to be prescribed in accordance with the provisions of this act. No physician shall prescribe and no pharmacist shall fill any prescription for liquor unless such stamp is affixed thereto. Every person who, otherwise than is authorized by this act, uses or who falsely makes, forges, alters, counterfeits, or re-uses any stamp made or used under any provision of this act, or with such intent uses, sells, or has in his possession any such forged, altered, or counterfeited stamp, or any plate or die used or which may be used in the manufacture thereof, or who shall make, use, sell, or have in his possession any paper in imitation of the paper used

in the manufacture of any stamp required by this act, shall, on conviction, be punished by a fine not exceeding \$1,000 or by imprisonment at hard labor not exceeding 2 years. The effective date of this section 2 shall be not earlier than January 1, 1934."

SEC. 3. Strike out the first paragraph of section 2 of the act entitled "An act supplemental to the National Prohibition Act", approved November 23, 1921, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 2. Only spirituous and vinous liquor may be prescribed for medicinal purposes. All prescriptions for any other liquor shall be void. But this provision shall not be construed to limit the sale of any article the manufacture of which is authorized under section 4, title II, of the National Prohibition Act."

SEC. 4. Strike out subdivision (a) of section 5 of the Prohibition Reorganization Act of 1930, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "(a) The Attorney General and the Secretary of the Treasury shall jointly prescribe all regulations under this act and the National Prohibition Act relating to permits and prescriptions for liquor for medicinal purposes, and the quantities of spirituous and vinous liquor that may be prescribed for medicinal purposes, and the form of all applications, bonds, permits, records, and reports under such acts: *Provided*, That all regulations relating to the Bureau of Prohibition in the Department of Justice shall be made by the Attorney General."

GEORGE M. COHAN

MR. PEYSER. Mr. Chairman, as a Representative from New York, I should like to announce that a great American, who happens to be a resident of the city that I represent, has honored us by a visit. I refer to a man who has put the American flag before the public in as large a way as any private citizen that I know of. He is the man that wrote the Grand Old Flag during the days of peace, and who composed that thrilling march Over There during the days of strife. I refer to that Yankee-Doodle American, George M. Cohan, who is now in the gallery. [Applause.]

MEDICINAL LIQUOR

MR. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes. Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, this bill seeks to liberalize the rules now applicable to physicians in their prescriptions of medicinal liquor. The bill had its genesis in the recommendations made by the Wickersham Commission, and that commission recommended to the country as follows—and the bill incidentally follows exactly these recommendations:

1. Removal of the causes of irritation and resentment on the part of the medical profession by—

(a) Doing away with the statutory fixing of the amount which may be prescribed and the number of prescriptions.

(b) Abolition of the requirement of specifying the ailment for which liquor is prescribed upon a blank to go into the public files.

(c) Leaving as much as possible to regulations rather than fixing details by statute.

These recommendations were concurred in by President Hoover. They have been concurred in by Dr. Doran, who is the head of the Prohibition Enforcement Bureau of the Treasury Department, who appeared before the Judiciary Committee and advocated this measure. These recommendations were approved by Colonel Woodcock, in charge of the enforcement division of the Attorney General's office, and he advocates this measure and asks you to pass it. There was no dry organization, as far as I know, with one exception, the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, that opposed the bill either in the Senate or in the House. The Anti-Saloon League had its legal representative present at the Senate hearings. He voiced no opposition to the bill. The inference therefore to be drawn is that the militant dry organizations, with the one exception, are unopposed to the bill. I say that advisedly. Mr. Dunford, counsel to the Anti-Saloon League, might well be consulted upon the subject.

This bill does not mean that all restrictions are taken from doctors in their prescribing. The bill is reasonable in the sense that it leaves all the restrictions not to inflexible statute but to flexible regulations; regulations which shall control the number of prescriptions that the doctor may use, the quantity that he may prescribe, the kind of liquor that he may prescribe, and the duration within which he may prescribe it, and those regulations must be adopted as a condition precedent to any changes in the present arrangement. They must be promulgated by the Attorney General and by the Secretary of the Treasury. The burden

thus is upon the medical profession to prove that the present limitations as to quantity and time and number of prescriptions are necessary. Medical science may so advance that they will want the regulations in some way modified. Otherwise, the regulations that exist today will exist tomorrow and the day after and next month. The burden is placed upon the medical profession to indicate to the Departments in question that medical science requires the changes.

At present, if an epidemic breaks out, the Department cannot permit a doctor to write more than 100 prescriptions every 90 days. He might easily justify 1,000. But he and the Department cannot increase the number even to save human life. Under my bill the Department may change the regulations and increase the number.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] was in error when he said that there would be undue interference with the local laws of States. That is utterly fallacious. Each State can determine for itself, under its police powers, what it may do relative to doctors' prescribing liquor. A State can abolish the practice—can be stricter than the Federal Government. If the gentleman will look at page 23 of the hearings, he will find set forth 21 States which at the time of the hearings, by their local statutes, precluded doctors from prescribing liquor. Since that time some six States, I believe, have changed their statutes so that they are allowing prescriptions at the present time. I have not checked up recently to be absolutely accurate, but I think we may say safely that today, at this moment, no less than 15 States prohibit doctors from prescribing a drop of medical liquor whatsoever. There is no interference with local laws so far as the bill is concerned.

The president of the American Medical Association comes from the gentleman's State. He is Dr. Carey, from the city of Dallas, Tex. He is president of that organization and controls the deliberations of the house of delegates of the American Medical Association, and he has come out foursquare for the bill. The organization has some 125,000 members. Its members are the cream of the profession—all influential members of their communities. Its recommendations must compel attention and enlist profound respect.

There are sufficient safeguards in the bill—I have not the time to go into them in detail—which will prevent diversion of alcohol for beverage purposes. The doctor must continue to keep his records, he must indicate the name of his patient on the stub of his prescription book, and must indicate the nature of the ailment. This requirement is not eliminated. These data must be open to the scrutiny of the Federal agents.

But we do not make it incumbent in this bill upon the doctor to send to the prohibition office, subject to public gaze as it were, the files that the doctor must keep. We do not place under the gaze of the curious and the wicked who may be in the prohibition office the nature of the ailment of the individual suffering in the various communities, so that the patient may be blackmailed. There are cases on record where there has been blackmail and extortion because of the knowledge obtained by minor clerks and irresponsible underlings in the prohibition offices concerning the ailments suffered by people in various communities.

Lastly, Mr. Chairman, there is a saving in this bill, and in this day of economy it is worth while considering that. We save \$110,000 per year because we do away with the necessity of having the Government supply the doctors with prescription blanks, which must be issued in triplicate, and which are printed on fine Government bond paper to prevent counterfeiting. Instead of that we allow the doctor to use his own prescription blank upon which he must affix and cancel appropriately a small stamp which the Government will furnish the doctor. Dr. Doran, Colonel Woodcock, and the Treasury Department have all approved of that change. They are gratified at the change because it does away with much of the red tape now binding the doctor and at the same time saves \$110,000 a year, the cost of printing the prescription blanks.

The present severe limitations on the quantities of liquor obtainable on prescription and the requirement of records disclosing the patient's ailment discourage many doctors from qualifying to prescribe, and makes it impossible in many instances for doctors who have thus qualified to prescribe sufficient quantities for their patients. Many doctors who have thus qualified nevertheless are loathe to involve themselves in the irritating intricacies of the prescription procedure. Thus patients are often driven to illicit channels for their supply of medicinal liquors. The record shows that only a very small amount of pure legitimate medicinal liquors are diverted to beverage use, while the amount of illicit liquor used for medicinal purposes is believed to be large.

All that this bill does is to permit the physician to treat the diseases of his patients and to promote their physical well-being, according to the exercise of his best skill and scientifically trained judgment subject to such regulations as are found by the administrative officers to be necessary to prevent diversion of medicinal liquors to beverage use.

This bill, therefore, has the following advantages:

First. It will aid in enforcement.

Second. It is in the interest of economy, as it involves a saving of \$110,000 per annum in Government printing costs.

Third. It removes the irritations which now harass and cause resentment of an honorable profession.

Fourth. It will encourage the procuring of pure medicinal liquors by the sick from legitimate sources.

Fifth. It will not in any way adversely affect the enforcement of the prohibition on the beverage-liquor traffic.

Permit me to submit the statement of Dr. William C. Woodward, legislative counsel, American Medical Association:

The passage of the Celler-Copeland bill, as it has been designated in the medical press, is the result of many years of effort on the part of the medical profession to obtain legislation to enable patients in need of medicinal liquor to have their physicians prescribe it for them in such quantities as are medically necessary.

A physician's right to prescribe liquor has heretofore been limited by arbitrary quantitative limits laid down in the statute, and based on no known medical principle.

The Celler-Copeland bill will enable patients to obtain what is medically necessary. The bill does away with none of the safeguards against the diversion of medicinal liquor to beverage purposes, for the Attorney General and the Secretary of the Treasury are fully authorized to make regulations limiting the quantity to be prescribed at any one time and the manner of prescribing, although the patient is always entitled to have prescribed for him what is medically necessary.

The physician, too, is still required to keep in his office a book record showing the nature of the ailments for which prescriptions are given, open to inspection by accredited officers of the law. Moreover, no physician can prescribe for a patient except after physical examination and when he believes in good faith that liquor is necessary for the relief and cure of the patient's ailments.

Mr. KURTZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I want only sufficient time to correct an erroneous impression given by our good friend from New York [Mr. CELLER]. He cannot name a dry organization in the United States that is in favor of this bill. Oh, because they do not come to his committee and fight any more is just for the same reason that you do not find any more Members now getting up here and opposing this bill. They realize that just now it is useless. This wet sentiment that now pervades the House must run its course. You have got to give this wet movement plenty of rope and let it go as far as it will before the reaction takes place.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I regret that I have not the time. They are waiting for the reaction. Soon the pendulum will start on its reverse swing, and then you may not expect such apathy.

We are going to have a division vote on this bill. That will show that there are yet some men in this House who do not stand up and favor a measure that will let doctors prescribe liquor for every thirsty person who has the money

to pay the doctor and the drug store. That is what will be done. As far as I am concerned, I am not going to ask for a roll-call vote, because I know that no matter how a man votes here now it will hurt him. If he votes dry, the wets will hammer the life out of him. If he votes wet, probably some dries will hammer him. I do not want to cause any trouble to colleagues on either side of the aisle. Just now is no time to create sentiment against men in Congress, so I am not going to ask for a roll call. Unless someone else asks for it, there will not be a roll call.

I want to say that every dry organization in the United States is against this bill; every one of them. Just as my friend from New York was mistaken when he was asked by the gentleman from Maine if the Department of Justice was in favor of this bill said, "Yes; both the Treasury Department and the Department of Justice are in favor of it," but he did not at that time qualify that. He in another instance said that he meant Dr. Doran and Colonel Woodcock had passed on it.

Mr. CELLER. Oh, no.

Mr. BLANTON. Now, just wait a moment. He said Dr. Doran had passed on it for the Treasury Department and he said Mr. Woodcock had passed on it for the Department of Justice.

Mr. CELLER. Will the gentleman yield in the interest of accuracy?

Mr. BLANTON. I am going to put in the question and answer just exactly as it occurred.

Mr. CELLER. The record speaks for itself, and I brought with me the letter of the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Ballantine, dated January 9, wherein he indicates he is in favor of it.

Mr. BLANTON. Wait a moment. I only asked for 5 minutes. The gentleman kindly offered me 10 minutes, but I only took 5 minutes. I am going to put in the RECORD the exact question which the gentleman from Maine asked my friend. He asked:

Are these two Departments in favor of it?

And my friend said:

Yes; both the Department of the Treasury and the Justice Department are in favor of it.

Mr. CELLER. That is correct.

Mr. BLANTON. He said he meant Dr. Doran and Mr. Woodcock, but I have positive evidence that the Attorney General of the United States never saw this bill. Attorney General Mitchell never did approve it, and I have positive evidence in my file to that effect.

diated Colonel Woodcock?

Mr. BLANTON. I am not now talking about underlings. I am talking about Departments. When the gentleman refers to the Department of Justice, he does not mean some underling, but he means the head of the Department. The Attorney General is the head of the Department of Justice, and he did not approve the bill.

Mr. Chairman, that is the correction I wanted to make.

Now, you will pass this bill. My friend says the States are protected. The States which do not have laws against it are not protected. They will remain unprotected until they can call their legislatures together. There is not a State now among the 48 States of this Nation, whose legislature is not in session, which is financially able to call the legislature into session to pass a bill to stop this unlimited whisky-selling by doctors and drug stores. You know the depression has struck the States. They have been overmanned like the Federal Government. They must retrench. They are hard up financially. Most of them now are borrowing money from the Federal Government. They are not able to have the legislature meet to pass a law to stop this. The responsibility for it will not be on my shoulders. You wet brothers are doing more to help keep the eighteenth amendment from being repealed by passing this bill than could be done by any dries. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOYLAN].

Mr. BOYLAN. Mr. Chairman, I simply arose to say that this question of making the Congress the wet nurse of the country is the cause of a lot of our present trouble. Everything that we eat is supposed to be regulated by Congress; everything we drink is regulated; everything we do is to be regulated by Congress. We are the great regulators. Therefore all the States come to us and lean on us for help and support. No matter what the occasion or necessity is, the cry is heard, "Oh, let the Congress do it."

Under the Prohibition Act and under the act restricting the amount of medicinal liquor to be prescribed by physicians Congress has set itself up as doctors; medical doctors. Dr. TOM BLANTON gets up and says to the medical profession of this country, "Now, let the doctors of Congress tell you what to do. All of your experience and all of your training amounts to nothing in the light of what we order you to do." Those men have spent long years in training not only in the elementary schools but in the medical schools, in post-graduate work and interne work in hospitals. We say to them, "You may only prescribe a certain amount of liquor within 10 days." Why not say, "You can only prescribe so many doses of castor oil within 10 days; so many doses of Coca-Cola; so many doses of digitalis, and so on"? If we are competent to prescribe as to alcohol, why not prescribe as to all of the other drugs in the pharmacopœia? Surely, Dr. TOM BLANTON, from Texas, and the other congressional doctors are not going to say to the medical profession of the United States, "You are restricted in this manner and you are restricted in that manner."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOYLAN] has expired.

Mr. CELLAR. I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BOYLAN. All I wanted to say principally was to pay a tribute to the medical profession of America; to the hundred thousand or more noble men and women of our country who have devoted themselves to the medical profession, a profession that requires many years of arduous study and work; a profession that is one of the most poorly compensated in the United States.

Yet, to my mind, a profession that does more real good for humanity than any other profession in the world. Let us say to these efficient men and women who have given their lives to this splendid and noble work: "Your hands are unfettered; you are permitted by the Congress to prescribe what you may see fit to prescribe for your patients in the light of the education and experience you have received."

To my mind the medical profession has been long-suffering for submitting during all these years to these regulations of the Congress. I am glad to see the dawn of a new day, when a new slant upon questions is taken by our people; and in that particular view we are going to hold it is unnecessary for the Congress to restrict our people as to what they should eat, what they should drink, or to regulate this noble profession as to what it should prescribe for the ills of a suffering people. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. KURTZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the remainder of the time on this side.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I am surprised to hear the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] characterize Dr. Doran as "a little underling." I do not think he meant to and certainly he is not justified in characterizing Dr. Doran in that manner. My experience with Dr. Doran has convinced me that he is a very high type of public official, performing his duty in accordance with his oath of office, and enforcing in a reasonable and proper way the laws which devolve upon his Bureau to enforce.

Mr. CELLER. I think the gentleman from Texas said Colonel Woodcock, not Dr. Doran.

Mr. BLANTON. Without reflecting on either, I said they were underlings in that they were not heads of Departments.

Mr. McCORMACK. With reference to this bill, its passage will remove a legislative insult to the great medical profession. That is the outstanding aspect of the bill which appeals to me. Hundreds of thousands of men throughout the Republic, members of an honored profession, trying to render service to the country and to their patients, as a result of the existing law, are limited in prescribing as their sound conscientious judgment and medical discretion dictate. By the passage of this bill we will remove this stigma from the medical profession.

It is hard for me to understand where there is any prohibition question involved in the bill before the House today. It is difficult for me to understand how the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] is going to answer to the members of this honored profession in his district when he tries to keep in the law this limitation, which is nothing more nor less than an insult to the profession. It casts suspicion upon the entire membership of the medical profession throughout the country.

It is true a small percentage will violate the ethics of their profession; it is true a small percentage of the medical profession, like a small percentage of any other profession, calling, or class, will do something they ought not to do, but that is no reason for indicating or casting suspicion upon the entire profession. The unethical or illegal acts of a very small percentage of one of the most honored professions of the world ought not to indict the entire profession; and because this bill removes a legislative insult to a great profession, removes an indictment against the great profession, which indictment has existed for 13 years, I am going to support it. There is no prohibition question involved in this bill; its purpose is to emancipate a great profession from the stigma of suspicion. No matter what their views are on prohibition, Members should support this legislation upon the theory that we are giving back to the medical profession the sound and proper right to exercise their sound medical knowledge. By passing this bill we are removing a law from the statute books of this country, a limitation imposed 13 years ago in the nature of a direct insult to one of the greatest professions of all time.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. McCORMACK. Certainly.

Mr. BLANTON. It is not an insult to the physicians of my home city. Every one of them is my friend.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is a matter between the gentleman from Texas and the physicians in his district.

Mr. BLANTON. They are my personal friends.

Mr. McCORMACK. I have no doubt that doctors of the gentleman's district have their own opinions. Of course, I would not ask any doctor in his district to vote against the gentleman because of one vote he may cast here. That would not be fair. A man's general legislative career should be viewed by the people of his district. So I am not trying to send a message to the doctors of the gentleman's district because of the gentleman's position today. They should view his general record and not vote for or against him on account of his stand on one measure. [Applause.] But I do say this limitation constitutes an insult to a great profession. The gentleman from Texas and I honestly differ. It is my opinion that 13 years ago this legislative insult was imposed as the result of the irrationalism that then prevailed with reference to the prohibition question. We are going today to remove it from the statute books and bring back to an honored profession respect and dignity in the exercise of medical judgment and knowledge and remove this legislative insult; and we are removing it as the result of a wave of normal, sane, tolerant rationalism that is running throughout the country today. [Applause.]

This bill is simply another step in the wave of rationalism which is spreading throughout the country on prohibition and related questions. Public opinion has awakened to the realization that prohibition of use is not the method or policy to pursue to regulate or control abuse. Pending the repeal of the eighteenth amendment this bill aims to correct an unreasonable, illogical, unnecessary, and unwise limita-

tion placed upon the practice of an honorable profession. The medical profession for years has advocated the passage of this bill; to obtain legislation to enable patients in need of medicinal liquor to have their physicians prescribe it for them in such quantities as are medically necessary. This bill does away with none of the safeguards against the diversion of medicinal liquor to beverage purposes. It establishes again the right of a physician to prescribe in accordance with known medical principle, not to have the right limited by arbitrary quantitative limits laid down by statute based on no known medical principle. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. PEYSER].

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Chairman, referring to the measure before the House, I may say that during the campaign I referred to the statute restricting the issuance of prescriptions for liquor as an insult to the medical profession, as has the gentleman from Massachusetts, who preceded me. I see in this bill a measure which will be in part only an apology for the insult to which they, the medical profession, have been subjected for the past 12 or 13 years.

A phase of the bill that I feel should appeal to any person is that you are putting in as a diagnostician, to determine the need of a prescription, a doctor instead of a governmental department, which is now prescribing instead of the physician, and for the persons it never sees. Who better than the doctor consulted should know the need of a patient? If present limitations are such as not to fill the bill, the patient is forced to resort to cheaper liquor procured in a manner not legitimate. This measure at least will open up the channel through which they may secure the liquor for their necessary needs, liquor of the proper grade, and they no longer will be forced to use the cheap alcohol they have had to use in the past. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, at the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the ranking minority member, Mr. KURTZ, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOCHT].

Mr. FOCHT. Mr. Chairman, I fully realize that the steam-roller is in full functioning order and that this bill and all administration bills will pass. But, my friends, I am amazed that someone here has not come in contact with some of the conditions that previously arose under this system of dealing out hard liquor throughout the United States. As has been said, under this bill you can deal it out in any State, whether it be a prohibition State or a wet State, and in unlimited quantities.

I am not so radically opposed to the use of liquor for medicinal purposes. The fact of the matter is my brother, who was a surgeon in the Army, prescribed whisky for 50 years with efficacy, especially in cases of pneumonia. I had a nephew who served in the World War, and another nephew now practicing medicine. All of them prescribed liquor in certain cases.

Under the provisions of this bill are you really making this medicinal liquor available to the poor people who need it when they are sick and distressed, who need it to fight the after effects of pneumonia?

Why do you not put some regulatory provisions in the bill as to the quality of liquor that these men are going to sell, and also as to the price they are going to charge these poor people? [Applause.] You give here unlimited power to the doctor. You say that they are great men and that you believe in the ethics of their profession and believe that the doctor is beyond such a thing as being a bootlegger. Most of them are, but some of them are not. Why not put a limitation on the power of those who are not beyond doing this and see that the poor, sick people for whom this bill is being sponsored by the Democratic Party get pure liquor and are not outrageously charged \$4.50 a pint for liquor that does not cost 50 cents a gallon to make?

I say with respect to this entire liquor business, Mr. Chairman, that it is not so much a question of the American people wanting to drink rum. I challenge any such state-

ment. The people who want to sell this liquor for a profit are the ones who have brought this about, and must be responsible for failure to provide the regulations I have suggested; that is, limit the quantity, prescribe the quality, and set a reasonable price.

Mr. CELLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOCHT. Yes; I yield to all of you at any time.

Mr. CELLER. I understood the gentleman to say that his brother is a physician. Would it not be an insult to say that your brother charges for a prescription? He charges for his services and for his medical advice and not for the prescription.

Mr. FOCHT. The charge is a dollar for the prescription and \$3.50 for the whisky, and we know about the cost of whisky, because they have made enough of it in my district, and there is plenty of it made in the gentleman's district, and the gentleman knows, if he knows anything about it at all, that it does not cost 50 cents a gallon to make liquor. This whole business is to stimulate the sale of rum, and this is going to be the biggest unrestricted wholesaling of poor and high-priced rum ever let loose upon the American people.

As to my brother, he needs no apology. He practiced medicine for 50 years, served as surgeon major in the Spanish-American War, gave a fortune to charity while he lived, willed one away when he died, and left orders that all accounts due him be canceled, which was done. [Applause.]

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BOLAND].

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I do not propose to stand here and talk about the merits of this bill, because it is pretty generally known what merit there is to the measure. The only reason I am here is because last year I presented a similar bill and had hearings on it before the Judiciary Committee.

I simply want to call the attention of the committee to the fact that many times it has been said in the House that it is unnecessary to prescribe liquor for medicinal purposes. Allow me to picture for 1 minute the men who work in the coal mines in the district I represent. These men go down into the bowels of the earth and blast off dynamite for the purpose of getting down the coal, and, naturally, the various gases get into their lungs and cause what is called "miner's asthma"; and although I am not familiar with the benefits of liquor in any way, I have been told by doctors there that the only medicine or the only thing worth while to help a man with miner's asthma is the prescribing of liquor, because it will cut the gases and the fumes out of the lungs and make it possible to offset the effects of this terrible disease.

Therefore, I am pleading with the Congress today to pass this bill for the benefit it will be to at least the miners whom I represent in the Scranton district.

Mr. MEAD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLAND. I yield.

Mr. MEAD. The gentleman's colleague from Pennsylvania made the argument that this would increase the cost of liquor. Does not the gentleman believe that liberalizing the dispensation of liquor, as we are doing by this bill, will have a tendency to reduce, rather than increase, the cost of liquor?

Mr. BOLAND. There is not any question about it.

I should also like to make the statement that the gentleman referred to has stated that the doctors charge for these prescriptions. I know many doctors in my district who are issuing such prescriptions now and do not charge a cent for them.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLAND. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Outside of the cities of Pittsburgh and Philadelphia, is it not a fact that the great Keystone State of Pennsylvania is dry?

Mr. BOLAND. No.

Mr. BLANTON. I mean outside of these two cities.

Mr. BOLAND. No; I will not concede that at all, because the district I represent is the Lackawanna district, and I came down here with all the nominations on two occasions and the only advertisement I had was that I would vote to repeal the eighteenth amendment.

Mr. BLANTON. That was due to the gentleman's personal popularity, and was in spite of his views on this question. The genial disposition of our good friend is so magnetic that naturally all of his constituents like him, and are willing to overlook his stand on a few questions.

Mr. BOLAND. The purpose of this bill is to accomplish three things:

First. Repeal the limitation on the number of prescriptions that may be issued during any certain period of time by any one physician.

Second. Repeal the restrictions on the method of writing prescriptions for liquors of all kinds so that a physician may write a prescription for liquor the same as he would write any other prescription.

Third. Repeal the limitation on the quantity of liquor of any kind that may be prescribed so that the sound discretion of the physician may be exercised in fixing the amount of liquor needed.

Surely a physician should not be restricted in using his best judgment as to whether a certain amount of liquor should be prescribed or not. Allow me to state that the doctors in Pennsylvania are among the highest-type gentlemen that we can boast of, and I rather feel that we can trust our physicians to prescribe what they think is useful; and personally I am in favor of whatever they would recommend.

It has always seemed arbitrary to me to limit the physicians to a certain amount of permits in a certain number of days, and if additional permits were necessary they would have to have the support of the health authorities stating that an epidemic was prevalent. It is plain to be seen that in the case of an emergency the physician might be without prescription blanks for some time before he could get an additional supply.

How embarrassing it must be to the profession to have a doctor go to see a patient whom he can relieve through a certain prescription and for whom he is restricted from prescribing the remedy. I believe today that Congress will relieve this arbitrary condition by passing this much-needed legislation, and I feel very much honored in having some little part in the passing of it.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) the third sentence of section 7 of title II of the National Prohibition Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows: "no more liquor shall be prescribed to any person than is necessary to supply his medicinal needs, and no prescription shall be refilled. No person shall by any statement or representation that he knows is false, or could by reasonable diligence ascertain to be false, induce any physician to prescribe liquor for medicinal use (1) when there is no medicinal need for such liquor or (2) in excess of the amount of medicinal liquor needed."

(b) Section 7 of title II of such act, as amended, is further amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a semicolon and the following: "but no physician shall be called upon to file any statement of such ailment in the Department of Justice or the Department of the Treasury or in any other office of the Government, or to keep his records in such a way as to lead to the disclosure of any such ailment, except as he may be lawfully required (1) to make such disclosure in any court in the course of a hearing under authority of section 9, title II, of this act, or (2) to make such disclosure to any duly qualified person engaged in the execution or enforcement of this act or any act supplementary hereto."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I submit the preferential motion that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BLANTON moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I realize that this is a futile motion. I make it just for one purpose. I simply want to get a rising vote on a division to see how many men still in the House of Representatives will vote to kill this kind of bill. This is my sole purpose.

My friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] spoke of this being a recommendation of the Wickersham Commission. I want to remind you again that that great Wickersham Commission was composed of 11 men and women, and 10 out of the 11 over their own signatures signed certain conclusions and recommendations. They were signed by 10 out of the 11 members, everyone signing them except Mr. Monte Lehman.

The first four conclusions signed over their 10 signatures were:

No. 1. The Commission is opposed to repeal of the eighteenth amendment.

No. 2. The Commission is opposed to a restoration in any manner to the legalized saloon.

No. 3. The Commission is opposed to the Federal or State Governments, as such, going into the liquor business.

No. 4. The Commission is opposed to the proposal to modify the National Prohibition Act so as to permit manufacture and sale of light wines and beer.

If he is going to follow the Wickersham Commission, why does not he follow it?—he has been voting against the recommendations of the Wickersham Commission ever since they have been made public.

I am assured by many good citizens in Pennsylvania that outside of Pittsburgh and Philadelphia, the great Keystone State of Pennsylvania stands against the repeal of the eighteenth amendment, and stands against beer and light wines, and they are going to make a fight in that great State that will shake it to its foundations before they get through.

Mr. BOLAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. BOLAND. I wish to state that when the convention is in session the gentleman will find out that his prediction is entirely without foundation.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, possibly, because they have some of the biggest and slickest political machines in both Pittsburgh and Philadelphia you ever dreamed of. They have machines there that will thwart the will of the people. They have been thwarting the will of the people for many years. I have been assured that they have a law-and-order league there and that they are going to look after elections hereafter.

I know that my good friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. BOLAND] is very popular, and a valuable Representative, and that he came here notwithstanding his wet views. His friends elect him without regard to his vote on the liquor question.

I want to say this in closing. You will pass this bill with only a handful of votes, comparatively, against it. There will be only a handful of votes in favor of my motion to strike out the enacting clause. But there is going to be a dry fight in this country that eventually will win, as sure as you are listening to my voice. There is going to be a reaction. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas to strike out the enacting clause.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BLANTON) there were 17 ayes and 86 noes.

So the motion was rejected.

The Clerk completed the reading of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee will now rise.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that the Committee had had under consideration the bill S. 562, an act relating to prescribing of medicinal liquors, and, under House Resolution 86, he reported the same back to the House without amendment.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill. The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BLANTON) there were 153 ayes and 59 noes.

So the bill was passed.

On motion of Mr. CELLER, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

A similar House bill was laid on the table.

AUTHORITY OF SPEAKER TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 89

Resolved, That the Speaker be, and he hereby is, authorized to sign the enrolled bills of the Senate, S. 562 and S. 598, notwithstanding the adjournment or recess of the House.

The resolution was agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT OVER UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next, April 3, 1933.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

RELIEF WORK IN CALIFORNIA

Mr. KRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 90

Resolved, That Congress in session extends to the Red Cross, the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, regular and special officers, ex-service men, and civilians its sincere appreciation for the splendid relief work done by all these agencies during and after the recent tragic earthquake in California; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent by the Clerk of the House to the mayors of each of the cities of southern California, to the heads of the organizations involved, and to the Young Democratic Clubs of California, whose members rendered such valuable services individually and in coordinating the work of all volunteer relief agencies.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I did not quite get the full purport of the resolution, but it seems to me that such a resolution is entirely against the precedents of the House. I do not know how far we have gone in these matters, but I think such a resolution should first go to a committee.

Mr. CLARKE of New York. Have we not already expressed our thanks by permitting the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to loan the people out there \$5,000,000? It seems to me that this is a lot of political bunk.

Mr. SNELL. I think the resolution should be looked over very carefully to see how far we go in it. I think it is a mistake to offer a resolution of that kind from the House without consideration by a committee.

Mr. KRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the resolution for the time being.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes on the subject of the Territory of Alaska and its development.

The SPEAKER. The Delegate from Alaska asks unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Speaker, today is the sixty-sixth birthday of the Territory of Alaska as a part of the United States. The history of Alaska goes back a long time, but only in the year 1867 was this great, this vast territory annexed to the United States by a treaty with Russia. On the evening of the 29th of March 1867 the then Secretary of State, Mr. Seward, was sitting in his house, situated down where the Belasco Theater now stands, playing whist. During the evening the Russian Ambassador was announced. He said to Secretary Seward:

Mr. Secretary, I shall come to the State Department, and we can then draw up the treaty and sign it.

Secretary Seward said:

Why wait until tomorrow. Let's make the treaty tonight.

The secretaries were called in, together with the experts, and they drew the treaty, and at 4 o'clock on the morning of March 30, 1867, the treaty was signed and the Government of the United States obligated itself to pay \$7,200,000 to the Government of Russia for this Territory of Alaska, and Alaska became part of the United States. The treaty was denounced, the Secretary of State was denounced, because it was said that we would never get \$7,200,000 out of Alaska, that it was not there, that it was simply an ice box. Some people said that it was like buying the North Pole. However, in spite of all the objections the Senate confirmed the treaty, and the money was paid.

What do we now find? Mr. Speaker, within the last 66 years the Territory of Alaska has produced appreciable wealth for the United States Government, so that the original purchase price, when compared with the wealth poured out of Alaska, seems like a drop in the bucket.

We have produced in these 66 years furs of the value of approximately \$120,000,000. We have produced in gold \$410,000,000 and upward during that time, and that is very important in this time of stress, when the burning question in the minds of the members of this body and of the Senate and of the administration is the currency. And in that connection let me say this: There is now in sight, using a mining engineer's term, in the Territory of Alaska, and there will be produced with the next 40 years, and possibly within the next 20 years, another \$410,000,000 of gold to go into the currency system of the country and to help us get out of this depression.

We have produced in other metals \$240,000,000, mostly in copper. One mine alone, up on the mountainside at Kennicott, has poured out this red metal to the value of almost \$200,000,000.

Now we come to the most important industry of Alaska and the most important product that comes out of Alaska; that is, fish, principally salmon. I would not be far wrong if I said the value of the fish exported to the United States from Alaska is very close to \$1,000,000,000 since 1866. Putting it in round numbers, the total is \$930,000,000. In a couple of years more, with normal prices for fish products, it will be close to a billion dollars.

In connection with the fisheries industry there is one thing I should like to bring to the attention of this House, and that is that the industry is threatened with extinction. It is threatened with bankruptcy by the depreciated currencies of foreign countries, particularly that of Japan.

The cost of putting up a case of fish in the Territory of Alaska will run between \$2.50 and \$6, dependent upon the location and dependent upon the quality and kind of the fish. The Japanese, with a 60-percent-depreciated currency, can take fish from the Soviet Government, can take their own fish, and put it on the market and get \$2 a case for it, and when they bring the money home to Japan it is around \$4.50, when they translate the gold into their own currency. Therefore they can undersell, and they have undersold, the American producer. The thing has just started. Unless something is done to remedy the situation with respect to Alaska, unless such a bill as the Hill bill is passed, I fear that next year the fishing industry in Alaska will be out of the picture. If anybody does try to operate he will be bankrupt, because the market is broken under them. That, of course, affects not only the people of Alaska, it affects not only the men engaged in the fishing industry, but it affects many people on both coasts and in the interior of the country.

I read an article not long ago about Texas. I have ridden across that great State. Of course I became a little wearied at times, but it is a great State. It is great in area. It is great in population. It is great in the genius of its people, and it is great in wealth; but in area I heard it compared once to one of the big Texas steers, and the lady who made

Mr. Secretary, I am authorized by my Government to comply with the terms of sale by my Government to the Government of the United States of Russian America. Tomorrow, if it suits you,

the comparison said you can imagine a steer with his fore feet in the Mississippi River, his hind feet between the Cascades and the Rockies, taking a drink out of the Atlantic Ocean, and his tail swishing the tall trees that border the Pacific coast; yet, after all, in size, great as it is, Texas is only a pigmy compared to Alaska. We do not have in Alaska all the glaciers that it was said covered the entire peninsula in Seward's time. When New York and New England were covered by glaciers in the last glacial age, when all the country to the north, and as far as we know, to the North Pole, was buried in ice, there was one place that was not buried in ice, and that was the lower valley of the Yukon River. There was no ice there. The climate was such that the ice would not form there.

Therefore in Alaska we find great mountains, we find a glacier a hundred miles long; but we find valleys hundreds of miles long. We find vast farm lands. We find wheat growing where people have taken the trouble to plow the ground and plant it. We can grow any garden vegetable in Alaska that can be grown in the northern tier of States of the United States. We can grow wheat and oats without any difficulty. The only trouble is that in these times there is too much of those things, and, therefore, what use to try to grow it in Alaska and export it to the United States when the farmers of Nebraska, Illinois, and Kansas are almost starving because they cannot get a fair price for their products? So far as the Territory is concerned, Alaska has not only great possibilities, it has not only great promise, but it has the assurance of the future, when people will go there, when they can go there under proper conditions, when they can develop not only its mineral resources but its agricultural resources.

I do not want to boast, but we do not pride ourselves alone any more than do the people of other States about our vast area, about our climate, and our products; but we pride ourselves to some extent, Mr. Speaker, upon the spirit of the people; upon the character of the population that has gone to Alaska and that lived in Alaska when the white man came there.

The SPEAKER. The time of the Delegate from Alaska has expired.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD]?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIMOND. I am reminded here of a thing that I read when I was a boy. I think it was written by Ruskin. He said:

I trust that in the times to come England will cast all thoughts of possessive wealth back to the barbarous nations among which they rose, and while the sands of the Indus and the adamant of the Golconda yet glisten to the housings of the charger and flash from the turban of the slave, England will lead forth her sons and say, "These are my jewels."

So, Mr. Speaker, I would say for Alaska that while the sands of the Indus and the adamant of Golconda yet glisten to the housings of the charger and flash from the turban of the slave, while men in other places outside of our own country are consumed only with a burning desire to pile up more of this world's wealth, that they must leave in the end, Alaska will, I trust, lead forth her sons and say, "These are my principal jewels."

Mr. Speaker, there is one great project I hope during my lifetime to see accomplished for the Territory of Alaska to aid in its material and spiritual development. We all know that at the very foundation of any civilized life lie means of ready travel. There have been some great dreams, and I hope you will not call me a dreamer although it may be that I am, and if so, I am not ashamed of it, because if we go back in our own history or in the history of this country, all great things that were worth while, all great things that led to the colonization and development of the country, came from dreams in the minds of men. Therefore the man who confers the greatest benefit upon his fellowmen is he who can dream wisely, he who has vision, and he who can make his dreams come true. I have had

a dream—not I first, but others have had it, too, and before I leave Congress I shall ask you to help make this dream come true—and that is the building of a highway from the United States to Alaska.

The gentleman from Colorado has been to Alaska, and I know he will understand the need, because he sympathizes with the aspirations of the people of Alaska; but unless you have been in Alaska you cannot imagine what a benefit and boon it would be to our people and the people of the United States to have a highway starting in the United States—in the State of Washington, I suppose—and running north through British Columbia and the Yukon territory into the Territory of Alaska. Then we would see people come in there; then it would be easy for them to come; and in these tough times, Mr. Speaker, it is very important to have a ready means and a cheap means of access to any territory if it is to be developed.

I was struck with one thing in the President's inaugural message. Without pretending to quote it exactly, the President said, "Where there is no vision the people perish." We of Alaska hope this vision can be made to come true.

Mr. Speaker, if there is one project more than another that ought to stir the imaginations of the American people and appeal at once to their desire for the betterment of economic conditions and to the love of adventure traditional in the race, it is the project of building a highway from the United States through the Dominion of Canada to Alaska. Of course, it is already built far up into British Columbia, but there remains to be constructed a considerable portion of it through northern British Columbia, through the Yukon territory, and into Alaska to connect with the internal road system of Alaska. After all, we know by experience and by history that all great things of this nature have been the accomplishment of men of broad vision, of far-reaching mental grasp; men who dreamed greatly and who made their dreams come true. This can be said of those who crossed the Appalachian Mountains, who settled the Mississippi Valley, who built the great transcontinental railroads, and who discovered and developed Alaska. This spirit was manifested in the building of the Alaska Railroad. But one thing further at this time is particularly needed, and that is a great highway open to all direct from the United States to Alaska.

The father of this idea in the Territory of Alaska, a man who has spent his waking and, I almost believe, his sleeping moments in promoting it, is my friend, Donald MacDonald, of Fairbanks. He has recently prepared a statement of the benefits of the road, and transmitted this statement to the Territorial legislature with the suggestion that it be incorporated in a legislative memorial urging the construction of the road. Mr. MacDonald suggests the following:

First. Expanding frontier markets have been a chief factor in the continuing prosperity of North America. Only in Alaska and the Canadian north does the opportunity for the development of such a market exist at present. In this connection it is worthy of note that the per capita consumption of goods is greater in Alaska than in any other country in the world.

Second. In all previous periods of depression an increase in gold production has helped materially to provide the stimulus which restored normal conditions. A mineral zone, highly auriferous, parallels the route of the proposed highway throughout British Columbia, Yukon territory, and Alaska, and this zone only awaits transportation to become productive. Alaska at the present time produces approximately \$150 in gold per annum for every man, woman, and child in the Territory. There are 400,000 acres of known gold-bearing gravels and quartz within the Territory of Alaska alone.

Third. The situation of the unemployed in all previous depressions has been relieved by the natural employment furnished by free land and free natural opportunity in connection with the land and the development thereof. The proposed Pacific-Yukon highway, or, as it is frequently called, the "International Highway", renders accessible a vast region of free opportunity.

Fourth. Disturbed, turbulent conditions exist in the Far East, the consequences of which no man can foresee. Alaska is in a highly critical and strategic position as an air base and thus the proposed projection of the Pacific-Yukon highway and airway is of transcendent importance. The "ribbon" of the highway not only furnishes an accurate guide; its series of connected air fields that will be built along it will not only be essential in the development of aerial traffic, but in the event of an emergency, the speed of surface transport—cutting the travel time in half between the supply depots of the United States and Alaska—may well be a deciding factor.

Fifth. This project will afford an immediate stimulus to the greatest producing and manufacturing interests of North America, the automotive, gas, oil, rubber, and accessory business, which exert very great economic influence. This is evidenced not only by the appeal of the mineral and agricultural resources of an undeveloped country, but by the stirring attraction of those resources of scenery and game. The highway stretches north through the last frontier to the Land of the Midnight Sun, passing back of the greatest mountain ranges on the North American Continent, peak after peak of transcendent beauty, tremendous glaciers still grinding out the Creator's work, smoking volcanoes still attesting that this is literally a land in the making; the game everywhere existing in its primitive abundance; caribou, moose, and sheep by the uncounted thousands; myriads of lakes that are full of fish and have never known the touch of an artificial lure—all this would stir the minds of the adventurous and mobile population of the United States. Not only would the Alaskan problem be solved by bringing such a market to the country, but a great stimulus would be given the interests aforementioned.

Sixth. As early as 1907, E. H. Harriman, the American financier, proposed the construction of the Trans-Alaska-Siberian Railway Co., which contemplated the construction of a railroad through Canada, Alaska, and Siberia, with a tunnel under the Bering Strait. The justly famous J. A. L. Waddell, originator of the modern steel railway bridge, was chief engineer. This project was defeated not because of the lack of economic resource but because of international complications. It is submitted that there are many times the reasons for such a project now than there were at that early date. It is further submitted that the evolution of automotive traffic will continue. It is probable that in 10 years such transportation means will be as economically efficient as a railroad and that for a fraction of the expense such high form of transportation will result over the proposed highway. It is not to be forgotten that the international highway and airway contemplates the ultimate development of a world's highway.

Seventh. The total cost of this projected enterprise has been carefully estimated from reliable data to be \$14,000,000. Of its total length of 2,000 miles, more than half is already built. Of this unconstructed length, less than 200 miles lie in Alaska. It is also apparent that Alaska would benefit out of all proportion to the length of line within her boundaries. It is also apparent that the financial requirement, when all the potentialities of the project are considered, does not constitute an obstacle. The obstacle arises in the distribution of the costs. The greatest length of line lies within the boundaries of the weakest member in point of financial resource.

I rely upon Mr. MacDonald's statement, for he has made an intensive study of the whole project. The construction of this highway would dovetail with the present plans of the administration for the relief of unemployment in Alaska and elsewhere by great public works. The building of this road would be the same sort of step for the development of our last great frontier empire as the building of the transcontinental railroads was for the development of the great regions west of the Mississippi River. The President has truly said: "Without vision the people perish." The building of the Pacific-Yukon Highway is a great vision. The opportunity is at hand to make this vision come true.

Sixty-six years ago Secretary Seward said: "Why wait until tomorrow? Let us make the treaty tonight." So today I may properly say: "Why wait until next year, or the next decade, or the next century? Let us go now."

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIMOND. Certainly.

Mr. GILCHRIST. Can the gentleman tell us something about the economic condition of the Indians of Alaska?

Mr. DIMOND. Yes.

Mr. GILCHRIST. I should like to know the gentleman's opinion and views upon this subject, either now or by way of an extension of remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. DIMOND. I have not got it in written form, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to at this point revise and extend my remarks, and I shall include therein an answer to the gentleman's question.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the Delegate from Alaska?

There was no objection.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the gentleman's time be extended 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIMOND. I am glad to answer the question of the gentleman from Iowa, because the condition of the Indians in Alaska at the present time is very pitiable in spite of the efforts of the people of the Territory with their limited funds and in the face of the depression to relieve the conditions.

The condition has been getting worse and worse; and this ties up, Mr. Speaker, with the matter to which I adverted a moment ago. The fishing industry in Alaska is in a bad way, partly, of course, on account of the depression, but largely, I may say, on account of the threat of depreciated currencies of other countries.

If the Indian is to make a living, it must be in the fishing industry. The majority of them earn their bread and butter in this industry. There is no other possible avenue open to them. It is true they can catch fish and live on a straight fish diet. I have lived in Alaska for many years. I have done almost every kind of labor there, including prospecting. I have lived on a straight fish diet for days—yes; for weeks—but it is not a very palatable diet. We have educated the Indians to the extent that they do not like to have a straight fish diet day after day and month after month. The only thing they can do is to find employment in the fishing industry, and employment is not available to the extent it should be. It is not available, Mr. Speaker, because the fishing companies, driven by this terrible competition, have brought into the Territory of Alaska many thousands of orientals to fill jobs that might be filled by the local inhabitants; yet there is nothing we in Alaska can do about it. In spite of this, nearly every packer, with two exceptions known to me, every salmon packer in Alaska lost money last year, lost it on account of low prices, and these low prices are partly caused by the depreciated foreign currencies. The Indians cannot find employment.

I received a heartbreaking telegram the other day from Kodiak. I know those villages down along Kodiak Island. Bancroft says that at one time Kodiak Island had 5,000 inhabitants, before the Russians came there. I do not believe there are 1,000 there now. I am informed by an honorable, upright man, Mr. W. J. Erskine, that their condition is pitiable.

I have gone to the Bureau of Indian Affairs but they inform me they have no funds, and I know the little funds appropriated for this purpose are exhausted.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIMOND. Certainly.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Can the gentleman give the House any specific information as to the present economic condition of the Metlakatians?

Mr. DIMOND. I will in just a moment. No appropriations are available. Alaska, of course, is hard up. Eighty-

one percent of our taxes come from the fishing industry, and the fishing industry is in terrible shape. We have no resources left to tax. The people are not wealthy, as is shown by the picture I have given you.

The wealth of Alaska has been poured into the United States. We find that there has come out of Alaska, been exported from Alaska, wealth to the value of \$1,700,000,000 since 1886, and there has gone back into Alaska from the United States, which has been of great benefit to the United States because it provided a market for the industries of the United States, merchandise to the value of \$900,000,000.

Mr. Speaker, it would take too long to go into this question of the Alaskan Indians. I have taken the matter up with the Bureau of Indian Affairs. It was considered this morning by the Committee on Indian Affairs of this House, and I now urge that a committee of this House or of the Congress be sent to Alaska this coming summer to study the entire situation with respect to the Indians in Alaska, and this program will tie up with the fishing industry. But I am deeply interested in the welfare of the native population of Alaska. They are my constituents. More than that they are my friends, and many of them are in desperate economic plight. The Territory is not able to take care of them all. They need help, they need it badly, and they need it without delay. I should like to take time here to paint for you the entire picture, but I know that you cannot give it to me now. I, therefore, urge with all the force at my command that a committee of this House or of the Congress be sent to Alaska this summer to study the situation and report back here so that at the coming regular session Congress will be in position to pass upon the legislation which I shall present for the relief of the native inhabitants of Alaska—indeed, Mr. Speaker, for the relief of all of the residents of Alaska. This will not be a pleasure jaunt for the committee. It will mean discomfort; it will mean hard work; but the results are certain to be of great service to Alaska. And more, Mr. Speaker, it will result in real economy, not only in money but in the lives and happiness of the great people of this great Territory.

I shall be very glad to write this whole thing out and present it either upon the floor or to the gentleman who inquired about it.

Now, to answer the other question with respect to the Metlakatla Indians, I think they are probably better off economically than any other Indians in Alaska, and I shall tell the gentleman why. A great reservation has been made for them, and they have been given this island. The island was taken away from other Indians and given to the Metlakatlans, who come from British Columbia. I am not criticizing the Government of the United States for doing this. The thing has been done, and I am glad to see the Metlakatlans there, and I am glad to say they are intelligent and self-respecting and industrious and are making a home for themselves; but if they were subject to unlimited competition, they could not survive. They would be in just the same condition as the other Indians in Alaska, because the Indians in Alaska cannot any more survive the fierce competition than the Indians in the United States.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 2 additional minutes, because I should like to inquire further in regard to the Metlakatla Indians.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Is it the gentleman's opinion that the fisheries on the island of the Metlakatlans, which I presume belong to the Indians themselves because of the fact that they own the island—

Mr. DIMOND. They belong to the United States, but the Indians have exclusive use of everything.

Mr. WOODRUFF. And that includes the fisheries, does it not?

Mr. DIMOND. Yes.

LXXVII—67

Mr. WOODRUFF. Is it the gentleman's opinion that the contracts that the Government has entered into in the years gone by with outsiders to carry on the fishing industry have been for the best interests of the Indians themselves?

Mr. DIMOND. I can only answer that, Mr. Speaker, by saying that I have never heard any complaint from the Metlakatla Indians. I had an opportunity to hear any complaints, because before coming down here I served for quite a number of years in the upper house of the Alaska Legislature, and if any serious complaint had been made I believe it would have come, sooner or later, to the attention of the legislature. Since coming to Washington one man, who forbade my using his name, said something about contracts—past, present, or future—and expressed some dissatisfaction, but since he would not let me use his name and would not let me do anything about it, it is like these anonymous letters that come to us. We cannot pay much attention to them. I have never made any investigation, but I spent some little time at Metlakatla during the last campaign—not very much time, only being there one evening—and no complaint was made to me by anybody there, either officials in the Indian community or others, with relation to the contracts.

Since I have started to speak I do recall now, because it has come to my memory in the last second, that a good many years ago—

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BRIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have 5 minutes more.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIMOND. I heard a good many years ago there was some dissatisfaction, but it is so vague and dim in my mind that I cannot recall precisely what it was. I know it was very ancient, indeed, because I have heard nothing since at least 1923, that being the year I first entered the legislature.

Mr. BRIGGS. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. DIMOND. Certainly.

Mr. BRIGGS. Has there been any increase in the settlement of Alaska in the last few years?

Mr. DIMOND. Yes.

Mr. BRIGGS. Has there been any tendency toward an increase, so far as the gentleman knows, in the settlement throughout this great area, where I believe the population statistics show there are perhaps less than 75,000 people, including both whites and Indians, in an area of over 500,000 square miles?

Mr. DIMOND. The area is 589,000 square miles, and the population of Alaska between 1920 and 1930, according to the census, increased 7.7 percent.

I want to explain one thing to the gentleman and to the House. The thing that put Alaska definitely upon the back trail with relation to population was the Great War. Alaska, necessarily, as any frontier country would be, was populated by single men, most of them being adventurers, more or less. They were men who went into the hills, and when the call to arms came, of course, they enlisted. Alaska did not get credit for many of them. Many of them would not enlist in Alaska, because it meant they could not get to France fast enough. Some of them went to Maryland to enlist, because there was a camp there, while others went to Long Island, N.Y. Most of them went out of Alaska, and they went out by the thousands. According to the records we have, Alaska furnished a greater proportion of its population to the American military and naval forces than any State, and, of course, this is to be expected, considering the character of the population. And remember that they would not take many Indians, although they are counted in the population. An arbitrary order was issued that no Indian could be taken, although many of them tried to enlist, and some succeeded. They were as patriotic as any of the people.

When these men got to France, and most of them did get to France, their minds were changed about many things. They had seen a new field of adventure, and I think I am

correct in saying that not over one fourth of them came back to the Territory of Alaska.

My own opinion is that the increase in the population of Alaska for the last decade, between 1920 and 1930, is due largely to the increase of births over deaths.

Mr. RANKIN. Is it not a fact that when the young men did come back they found the canning industry had reserved all the fishing grounds and they had to go somewhere else?

Mr. DIMOND. That is probably true in some cases.

Mr. RANKIN. I know it is true in some. We had up a case where two young men enlisted, laid aside their fishing tackle, and went to war, and when they came back they found that the waters in which they had been fishing had been allotted to one canning company that had been prosecuted for selling decayed or spoiled salmon to the Government during the war for our soldiers, and these two young men were forced to go elsewhere to make a living.

Mr. DIMOND. I have not any particular knowledge of the instance to which the gentleman from Mississippi refers. I think, however, it probably arose under some orders creating fishing reservations, made when Mr. Hoover was Secretary of Commerce. It is true at that time reservations were created in the waters of Alaska. They were parceled out, distributed among the cannery companies, and all others were excluded from these reservations.

But that did not last long. The reservations were abolished.

Mr. RANKIN. The law was changed, but the regulations were not materially changed. Is it not a fact that the same discrimination prevails as before?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RANKIN. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have 5 minutes more.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Is it not a fact that in Alaskan waters today the same discriminations are in force that were in force when Mr. Hoover was Secretary of Commerce?

Mr. DIMOND. I want to answer the gentleman's question by going a little further than he has gone. I think in some respects the regulations are worse.

Mr. RANKIN. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. DIMOND. There are fishing traps used, and I want to say that that is one of the reasons for the bad economic conditions of the Indians and others. These conditions are partly caused by the unrestricted use of these fishtraps. I have no doubt the honorable Commissioner of Fisheries will say that the use of traps is not unrestricted. Technically that is true, but practically it is not true, because the seiners under the regulations cannot compete with the fishtraps, and the cannery will not take fish from the seines when they can get fish from the traps cheaper.

I am opposed to the unrestricted operation of the fishtraps in the waters of Alaska, and I am going to try and have this administration change it.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DIMOND. I yield gladly.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman from Alaska has put his finger on the trouble. In my opinion, the use of these traps not only excludes the Indians from the use of these streams that their fathers have had the use of for thousands of years but they are responsible for the very conditions he has described in the falling off in population.

Is it not a fact that if we had in force in Alaska the same fishing regulations they have in British Columbia, the traps would be removed and the individual would be permitted to earn his living by fishing as they do everywhere else in the world except in Alaska, and that the Indians would be taken care of and the white population of Alaska would considerably increase, and that many people would go there to make it their permanent home?

Mr. DIMOND. Answering the gentleman, I would say that I concur in his views. I am not intimately familiar in every detail with the fishing regulations in force in the waters of British Columbia; but from the knowledge that I

have of them I think they are much better in the interest of the local population than are the fishing regulations that now are, and for some years past have been, in effect with respect to the waters of Alaska.

Mr. PARSONS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIMOND. Yes.

Mr. PARSONS. What is the gentleman's opinion with reference to the future production of the fisheries in those waters if the same regulations are followed there as have been the last 10 years? Will the fisheries not be destroyed?

Mr. DIMOND. I am not able to say that. The production of fish in the waters of Alaska has not varied greatly in the last 10 years. Occasionally the pack runs up as high as 6,000,000 cases, and sometimes down as low as 4,000,000 cases. I have not the exact figures at hand. Last year I think was an average yield—and I am speaking now solely of salmon—when the total product was somewhere around 5,000,000 cases. I think the regulations are such as not to imperil the future of the fisheries in Alaska. I am not complaining of the regulations on that account, though there may be some places where the regulations ought to be changed, but I do not claim to be an expert on that particular point. I want to answer the gentleman further by saying there is a cure for all this.

Give the Alaska Legislature the power to legislate with respect to the fisheries of Alaska, and we will take care of it up there ourselves. We do not need any help down here to make laws and regulations concerning fisheries, and I say that with the utmost deference to the Members of this body who have been so kind and sympathetic to me and to my predecessors.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Alaska has again expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that his time be extended for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIMOND. It is almost impossible to put the situation before the Members of this body and of the other House and before the administration so that it can be fully understood. The trouble lies in trying to show you the exact picture. I only hope that a committee can go up to Alaska this summer and study the fishing industry. I also think they should look into the condition of affairs in respect to the Indians. This putting the power in the hands of the legislature is almost a religion with me—it is a political religion—for I believe in home rule. The people up there are just as honorable and honest and intelligent as the people of any other place, including the Indians. Give the Alaska Legislature the power to legislate with respect to the fisheries of Alaska, and they will take care of them, and they will settle the difficulties of the local population and at the same time protect the industry, because they have got to protect it. Congress will still have supervisory power over the legislation of Alaska; and if it thinks that any law passed by the Alaska Legislature is foolish or confiscatory, it can be changed by Congress.

Mr. EDMONDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIMOND. I yield.

Mr. EDMONDS. Has the gentleman taken any action at all in regard to Japanese competition?

Mr. DIMOND. I have not, except to discuss it with quite a number of Members in this body. I particularly took up the matter and discussed it with Representative HILL, the gentleman from Washington, the author of the bill, and he suggested that I see the Secretary of State and the President. I do not know whether I can see the Secretary of State and the President or not. They may not have time to talk to me about the matter. However, it is vital to the fisheries of Alaska, and it is also vital to the fisheries of Washington and of Oregon and of California; and if something is not done to correct the situation, you are going to see the salmon-packing industry wiped out.

Mr. EDMONDS. I received a letter from California in which it is stated that 350,000 people are out of work now because of the encouragement given to Japanese canned

goods coming into this country. I am wondering whether the provisions of the tariff bill which allow the President to declare an embargo have ever been tried.

Mr. DIMOND. I was informed here by somebody that the provisions of the tariff bill would not apply. I do not know. I know little about the tariff.

Mr. EDMONDS. I think a little study of the section of the tariff bill would show that the President has a right, if undue competition is exhibited, to declare an embargo if he so desires, and that would give 350,000 people work on the Pacific coast.

Mr. DIMOND. One reason I did not pursue that proposition is because I knew the Representatives in this body and in the Senate from Washington and Oregon and California were undoubtedly working on it, and they have much more power than I can hope to possess. If they, with their influence and experience and votes, could not persuade this House and the other House to pass some remedial legislation, I do not know how the Delegate from Alaska could do it. I do not know how the Delegate from Alaska could ever be able to persuade the President it was necessary to be done.

Mr. EDMONDS. We would not have to spend any money in reforestation in Alaska or on that coast if you could get your canned-goods people back to work.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIMOND. Surely.

Mr. RANKIN. The tariff is one thing that has wrecked the country now. The provision which the gentleman from Pennsylvania referred to might help the canning industry a little, but it would not do any good to the working people of Alaska.

The gentleman from Alaska [Mr. DIMOND] is trying to do something for the people who are entitled to work in those fisheries trying to make a living. Now, with reference to his proposition to turn this over to the Territory of Alaska, I may say I am more or less in sympathy with that proposition. As I understand it, the United States Government gets no revenue from those fisheries, except from income and inheritance taxes. That is right, is it not?

Mr. DIMOND. That is correct.

Mr. RANKIN. Then it would take no revenue from the United States Government to give the Territory of Alaska complete control over the fisheries, or approximately complete control. Is that correct?

Mr. DIMOND. That is correct.

Mr. RANKIN. Now, I want to ask the gentleman this question: This is one thing that to me is important. All up and down those streams I get complaints almost every month from the Indians saying that they are driven from the fishing grounds and that many of them are on starvation because they are denied an opportunity to fish for a living in the very waters that their people have fished in for hundreds of years. If this power were turned over to the Territory of Alaska, I want to know what assurance we would have that those Indians would be taken care of and their ancient fishing rights restored to them and protected?

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Speaker, nobody can give any legally enforceable assurance to the gentleman or to this body. You must rely upon the good sense and patriotism of the people of Alaska, and you must rely upon their selfishness, because enlightened selfishness alone will impel them to take care of the Indians. If you want to go into the political sphere, the Indians are all citizens and nearly all of them are entitled to vote. The Indians are in the majority in population. So if they are not treated fairly by the people of Alaska, you will have another legislature, and there will be some changes whereby the Indians will be treated fairly. But the trouble is not in Alaska. The trouble is not in the non-Indian population of Alaska. I have never seen any substantial disposition on the part of any of the people of Alaska to deal unfairly with the Indians. It is true there are some exceptions. There are some people who are prejudiced. There are some who simply hate the natives. They absolutely hate and despise them. They do not want to have anything to do with them. But that is not the

sentiment on the part of the people generally. The people of Alaska are fair; they are generous.

Mr. BLANCHARD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIMOND. I yield.

Mr. BLANCHARD. Just as a matter of information, may I ask in whom the control of the fisheries is now vested? Is it entirely a departmental matter?

Mr. DIMOND. It is entirely a departmental matter, and it is in the Bureau of Fisheries. The present head of the Fisheries Bureau is Mr. Henry O'Malley, and he has been the head of it during the last administration and for some time before that, I think.

Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIMOND. I yield.

Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma. Who is it that owns and operates these concerns? Are they local people or are they from other countries, using the traps and bleeding the people, not only the Indians but the poor white people also?

Mr. DIMOND. The canneries are owned by various people. Mostly they are corporations, the stockholders of which live outside of Alaska.

Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma. And the traps are owned by the canneries?

Mr. DIMOND. Not all of them. Most of them are. Some of them are owned by independent people. This may be of interest: In 1929 I introduced a memorial in the legislature. That is about all we could do with respect to the fisheries in the Alaskan Legislature—memorialize Congress. I introduced a memorial to limit each cannery to two traps for every line of machinery operated. I do not have time to explain what a line of machinery is, but this memorial, if followed, would have cut out more than half the traps in Alaska. Unfortunately at that time some people were enamored of traps. What I am now about to say is not politically partisan, because I realize that politics does not cut much figure with respect to Alaska. But the Democrats in the senate of the Territorial legislature voted for this memorial and the Republicans all voted against it, so it failed. Since then I have made representation to the Bureau of Fisheries, but after all I was only one man in the Territory of Alaska, and I was not listened to. Or if I was listened to, nothing was done along the line I suggested.

Mr. EDMONDS. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DIMOND. I yield.

Mr. EDMONDS. Are there any dragnets used now?

Mr. DIMOND. There are seines used. You might call them dragnets. That is a term that is not used in the fishing industry.

Mr. EDMONDS. What is the term used?

Mr. DIMOND. There are purse seines, which simply surround a school of fish and scoop them all up. Then they use gillnets.

Mr. EDMONDS. A purse seine is the thing I meant. Do they use those now?

Mr. DIMOND. They use them in places; yes.

Mr. EDMONDS. Are they allowed to use them under the law?

Mr. DIMOND. Yes; in places.

Mr. EDMONDS. But that is not operated by steam?

Mr. DIMOND. No. That is not operated by steam.

The SPEAKER. The time of the Delegate from Alaska has again expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have 2 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. I will ask the Delegate from Alaska if he is satisfied with the administration of Mr. O'Malley?

Mr. DIMOND. No, I am not; to answer the gentleman.

Mr. RANKIN. I agree with the Delegate from Alaska on that also.

Mr. SIROVICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIMOND. Yes.

Mr. SIROVICH. Does the gentleman realize that in Bristol Bay for 6 weeks of every year during the months of July and August, as I understand, 35,000,000 red salmon come in, and that along the shores of Bristol Bay the land is owned by the canneries, that the California and Alaska packers have never permitted any other organization, group, or individual to own land there but monopolize completely, or at least to the extent of 70 percent, this great resource for themselves? It not this right?

Mr. DIMOND. To answer the gentleman I must say that I do not know.

Mr. SIROVICH. For the benefit of my friend I may tell him that this is the testimony given before the Committee on Merchant Marine, Radio, and Fisheries.

Mr. DIMOND. Yes. I have read very carefully, several times, the report of the hearings before this committee, and I wish to thank the gentleman for his position there in support of the Alaskan fishermen. But there are no fish-traps in Bristol Bay and this is a great help.

Mr. Speaker, it would not be fair to some of the packers of Alaska to say they are all trying to gouge, and get the most out of the people of Alaska. Some of them are really high-minded and want to be fair. Some of them even would be generous, if they could, but the trouble with this industry, as with many others, is that there are some people who will not play the game. There are some good canners there, too. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, to understand the application of the Act of March 22, 1933, to the possessions of the United States it is necessary to refer, first, to the National Prohibition Act, and to the act supplemental thereto, approved November 23, 1921, known as the Willis-Campbell Act.

The first paragraph of section 20, title III, of the National Prohibition Act is as follows:

That it shall be unlawful to import or introduce into the Canal Zone, or to manufacture, sell, give away, dispose of, transport, or have in one's possession or under one's control within the Canal Zone any alcoholic, fermented, brewed, distilled, vinous, malt, or spirituous liquors, except for sacramental, scientific, pharmaceutical, industrial, or medicinal purposes, under regulations to be made by the President, and any such liquors within the Canal Zone in violation hereof shall be forfeited to the United States and seized: *Provided*, That this section shall not apply to liquor in transit through the Panama Canal or on the Panama Railroad.

It will be noted that this section does not fix any limitation as to the alcoholic contents of the beverages dealt with therein. By Executive order promulgated January 7, 1920, President Wilson adopted—section 2—the definition of section 1, title II, of the National Prohibition Act, including the one half of 1 percent limitation. The Willis-Campbell Act (see below) subsequently extended to the Canal Zone the National Prohibition Act, including, of course, the definition of intoxicating liquors in section 1, title II, thereof.

The National Prohibition Act was amended on November 23, 1921 (42 Stat. 222), this act being known as the Willis-Campbell Act. Section 3 thereof provided:

That this act and the National Prohibition Act shall apply not only to the United States but to all territory subject to its jurisdiction, including the Territory of Hawaii and the Virgin Islands; and jurisdiction is conferred on the courts of the Territory of Hawaii and the Virgin Islands to enforce this act and the National Prohibition Act in such Territory and islands.

The effect of this legislation is to extend the provisions of the National Prohibition Act, as amended and supplemented, to all the possessions of the United States, including Guam, Tutuila, and so forth, with the exception of the Philippine Islands. The Organization Act of the Philippine Islands provides in this regard (39 Stat. 547):

That the statutory laws of the United States hereafter enacted shall not apply to the Philippine Islands, except when they specifically so provide, or it is so provided in this act.

The act of March 22, 1933, provides in section 3 (a):

Nothing in the National Prohibition Act, as amended and supplemented, shall apply to any of the following, or to any act or failure to act in respect of any of the following, containing not more than 3.2 percent of alcohol by weight: Beer, ale, porter, wine, similar fermented malt or vinous liquor, or fruit juice; but the National Prohibition Act, as amended and supplemented, shall apply to any of the foregoing, or to any act or failure to act in respect of any of the foregoing, contained in bottles, casks, barrels, kegs, or other containers, not labeled and sealed as may be prescribed by regulations.

Section 4 (c) of the act of March 22, 1933, also provides for certain penalties for engaging in the manufacture for sale of beer, ale, porter, wine, similar fermented malt or vinous liquor, or fruit juice, without a permit or in violation of the terms of a permit; and section 4 (d) states:

This section shall have the same geographical application as the National Prohibition Act, as amended and supplemented.

It is apparent, therefore, that in all the possessions of the United States, with the exception of the Philippine Islands, the provisions of the National Prohibition Act relating to beer, ale, porter, wine, similar fermented malt or vinous liquor, or fruit juice, containing not more than 3.2 percent of alcohol by weight, are repealed, provided the containers thereof are labeled and sealed as required by regulations. This would seem to leave, in effect, the local laws of those possessions, if any, on this subject, with the exception of those made subject to a like limitation by section 3 (b) of the act of March 22, 1933, and subject to the further requirement of section 4 (b) (1) of that act as to the alcoholic limitation to be authorized by permit in accordance with the local laws.

In many of the possessions dealt with herein the internal revenue laws of the United States are not in force; consequently, in paragraph (a), section 1, of the act of March 22, 1933, the application of that section is confined to the States, the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii, and the District of Columbia. This leaves the matter of the imposition of the occupational and commodity taxes in such possessions to the local laws, if any, or to the enactment of laws on that subject.

Mr. MEAD. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. Speaker, very happily for the people of this country, and by reason of the courageous leadership of our President and the cooperation given to him by the House and the Senate, confidence has been restored in our country. By the prompt passage of a program of legislation we have now begun to stimulate and resuscitate business in America. There is in my judgment a number of important matters still to be considered before business becomes normal again. The Post Office Department will have to change its system, revise its rates, and give to the people of this country that high standard of service which they enjoyed prior to the depression.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEAD. Certainly.

Mr. RANKIN. Can the gentleman from New York inform the House whether anything has been done with reference to reducing first-class postage to 2 cents?

Mr. MEAD. I am glad the gentleman asked that question. On the very day this session convened I introduced a bill, H.R. 2, calling for a return to 2-cent postage, amending the Revenue Act of 1932 by restoring the former rate of postage. It was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means. The distinguished chairman of that committee has also presented a bill, H.R. 3753, which not only restores 2-cent postage but repeals the tax on bank checks and continues the gasoline tax for 1 year. It is a meritorious measure, and in my judgment cannot be reported to the House too quickly.

Right at this time, when we have restored confidence and begun again to build up the business of the country, the

Post Office Department can do a great service by increasing its facilities and decreasing its first-class rates.

Mr. PARSONS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEAD. Yes; I yield.

Mr. PARSONS. Is anything being done with reference to preparing a bill to raise rates on those classes of mail which are carried at a loss, so that they will be made to pay their way?

Mr. MEAD. Answering the gentleman from Illinois, I may say that we have a Cost Ascertainment Commission. This Commission, after investigation, arrives at what it believes to be a proper and reasonable cost for handling the various classes of mail. The method pursued by this Commission, of necessity, produces conclusions that are not always accurate. It is almost impossible to ascertain the accurate cost of carrying a letter from New York to San Francisco, considering all the changes and transfers that it may have to go through. It is equally difficult to levy an equal and just charge upon parcels carried by parcel post, which may be handled by a slower and less expensive method. At the best these figures are but estimates.

The Post Office Department, in my judgment, would suffer no deficit, there would be no loss, if we could continue the normal increased volume of business, which in some measure was diminished when we increased postage rates. What we should do is to reduce postage rates and increase postage volume. This would decrease measurably the cost of distributing mail and would enable us to handle each classification of mail at a lower figure than is now the case. [Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MEAD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. PARSONS. Will the gentleman yield for a brief question?

Mr. MEAD. Yes; I yield.

Mr. PARSONS. Does the gentleman believe that all classes of mail should pay their way?

Mr. MEAD. I certainly do; but before I would make any increases I would reduce the rates on mail in such classes as warrant a reduction, which would increase the volume and thereby increase the revenue.

Mr. ELLZEY of Mississippi. Is it not a fact that the revenue from the 3-cent postage rate is considerably less for the same period of time than from the former rate of 2 cents?

Mr. MEAD. I will say that the gentleman is right by about \$50,000,000. I believe we have suffered a loss of \$50,000,000 by raising the rate.

Mr. BLANCHARD. If the gentleman will permit, I should be pleased to have the gentleman state what those figures are.

Mr. MEAD. I will come to that in just a moment.

Mr. RAGON. If the gentleman will permit, let me interrupt just to get this straight, because someone is wrong about the matter. As I understood the gentleman from Mississippi, he asked if the amount of revenue derived from 3-cent postage is less than what was formerly derived from 2-cent postage, and I understood the gentleman to say that the gentleman from Mississippi was right by \$50,000,000.

Mr. MEAD. I will say to the gentleman that I estimate we have suffered a loss of at least \$50,000,000 by increasing the rate from 2 cents to 3 cents.

Mr. RAGON. I took this matter up, I may say to the gentleman, the other day with the Treasury Department, and they told me there that the postal receipts were greater this year than they were last year, and that if you took into consideration the reasonable loss in postal revenue that would be expected from the depression, then the fact that they had more revenue this year than they had the year before would indicate that the 3-cent postage rate is a paying one.

Mr. MEAD. Of course they are trying to defend the action taken a year ago.

Mr. RAGON. It strikes me, however, there is a great deal of force in what they say. The chairman of the Ways and Means Committee is trying to get the facts about this matter and so far we have been unable to find anyone who could tell us about the actual productivity of the 3-cent postal rate; but it seems to me that if they had more postal revenue this year than last year, this would indicate that the 3-cent postage rate has brought in more money.

Mr. MEAD. Let me develop the argument I was making a moment ago and I will show that, as a matter of fact, the figures for 1933 will indicate a reduction in revenue amounting to \$50,000,000.

In 1932 there were approximately 13,000,000,000 pieces of first-class mail matter handled by the Post Office Department, and from figures furnished by the department there will be about 8,000,000,000 pieces handled in 1933. This means a loss of 5,000,000,000 pieces of first-class mail and a loss of 5,000,000,000 pieces of first-class mail at the 2-cent rate is \$100,000,000; the revenues from all first-class mail in 1932 amounted to \$310,000,000. That was 9 percent less than in 1931. That was the normal decrease due to our economic situation. If the same normal reduction had occurred for 1933, due to the depression, the revenue would have been \$292,000,000. That is considering the normal drop resulting from the depression. However, figuring the 8,000,000,000 pieces of first-class mail, which include 1-cent postal cards, as well as 3-cent letters, at the full rate of 3 cents each the revenue will be but \$240,000,000, rather than \$292,000,000. So from these figures we find that the loss due to the increased postage rate is approximately \$52,000,000.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEAD. I shall be pleased to yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Is it not a fact that even at 2 cents the Government makes a profit on first-class mail and it is the only mail that the Government does make a profit on?

Mr. MEAD. It is the only mail, according to the Cost Ascertainment Commission, which shows a profit, and in the good business years it produced as much as \$75,000,000 in revenue.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MEAD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN rose.

Mr. MEAD. If the gentleman will just withhold his question for a moment, I want to develop the argument I am trying to make a little further by explaining the attitude of the Postmaster General during the administration of President Grover Cleveland, when an economic depression set in to grip the Nation. Here is the position Mr. Bissell, the Postmaster General, took at that time. Contrast it, if you will, with the attitude taken by the last Postmaster General, who, from the very time he assumed office, advocated, even before the depression, an increase in first-class postage rates from 2 cents to 2½ cents. Here is the recommendation made by Postmaster General Bissell in 1893:

When adverse business conditions prevail, an ordinary business establishment may overcome them in part by economies of management and retrenchment of expenditure. Not so with the Post Office. It cannot and should not stop to consider little economies. Its duties and obligations to the public become at once intensified and enlarged. It must exert itself to the utmost to secure the best possible results in the way of celerity, accuracy, and security in the dispatch of mail and without sparing any reasonable expense in that behalf.

We reduced the number of employees in the department, curtailed the service, and increased the rates to the public, just the contrary to the action taken by Postmaster General Bissell. We increase the cost, diminishing the service, and add to the deficit.

Our committee made somewhat of an investigation of this subject; we addressed inquiries to many post offices in the United States. You would be surprised and amazed to know how the postage saving thought has gripped the country.

Every known device and scheme is attempted in order to divert mail from the post office. Systems have been instituted as the result of the increased cost that will take years to offset. It will be a long time before we can get some of this business into the Department again.

I have here the postal receipts from 50 industrial offices for February 1932. For February 1932 these offices show revenues of \$2,831,000; for February 1933, \$2,659,000. I have also a statement here from 50 selected cities, all different from the ones I have just given. In February 1932 the revenues from those offices were \$24,060,692.27. February 1933 it was \$22,559,000. These figures show a loss in the total gross revenues, even though we raised rates 50 percent.

Mr. HOEPEL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEAD. Yes.

Mr. HOEPEL. Will the gentleman explain how much revenue is lost per year by the free distribution of newspapers?

Mr. MEAD. I do not have those figures here.

Mr. PATMAN. I have it here, and I should like to give the information.

According to the annual report of the Post Office Department for 1932, the daily newspapers cost the Government \$36,409,577.82 more than they paid in postage; other newspapers and magazines cost \$40,000,000 more than they paid the Government; ocean mail contracts, \$21,666,103; aircraft, \$20,586,107; and parcel post (mail-order houses), \$33,000,000 more than the Government received from these services.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. MEAD] is rendering the country a great favor through his services as chairman of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. The Members of the House of Representatives feel indebted to him.

Mr. MEAD. The figures presented by the gentleman from Texas are taken from the cost ascertainment report. They are the official figures of the Department. Unfortunately, the second-, third-, and fourth-class postage all contribute toward the postal deficit. The ocean and air mail subsidies also contribute to the postal deficit, but all of these services have been allowed to continue without change, while an increase has been placed on the first-class postage, an increase that taxes every home and individual in the country, and this class was the only one that was paying its way. For that reason I say it is unfair and unjust and should be repealed. [Applause.]

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, the Hitler dictatorship fouls the senses of the civilized world. Religious persecution is the most violent form of fraud. Under the guise of religion, whose main relation is to the future, material harm is done in the present. Before mankind this country has erected itself a live and strong monument to toleration. Our State Department is well within the best American tradition to assert our disfavor to a government that has forgotten the equality of men under a God we all profess.

Mr. THOMASON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMASON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, I wish first to read a resolution that was passed a few days ago by the unanimous vote of the Legislature of the State of Texas, which I think is self-explanatory:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 27

Whereas for some 14 years the War Department of the United States maintained Fort D. A. Russell, a military outpost of considerable importance, because of its strategic location as a protection for many miles of territory bordering the Republic of Mexico; and

Whereas the climate of the area in the Davis Mountains in which was located this historic fort is such as to provide all-year-

round facilities for the training of soldiers in the service of our country, who perform a duty the value of which is unlimited; and

Whereas with the beginning of this year, 1933, the said Fort D. A. Russell at Marfa, Tex., was abandoned and deserted by the War Department by transferring its personnel, which was composed of a Cavalry unit, to Kentucky, for the purpose of having it motorized; and

Whereas there now remain on the site of this fort sufficient equipment and buildings to reestablish to good effect the military post which for so long so ably protected from invasion by neighboring foreigners many miles of valuable property; and

Whereas since the 1st of January 1933 five raids of such magnitude as to create much fear and unrest among residents of the border section adjacent to Mexico have been made upon the property herewith enumerated: The Chinata Ranch, January 22; the Jake Baldwin Ranch, February 8; the Jack Rawls Ranch, February 25; the J. L. Sublett Ranch, March 2; and the L. C. Brite Ranch, March 3; all of which is confined within the bounds of Presidio County, which in territorial extent embodies an area comparable in size to the combined States of Rhode Island and Delaware; and

Whereas with the abandonment of Fort D. A. Russell the protecting buffer for huge distances along the Mexican border has been removed and hundreds of miles of territory are now without protection, and, as a direct result, this portion of Texas—the southwestern boundary of the United States—is in a state of considerable demoralization because of the absence of the influence exerted by a unit of the military sufficient in size to adequately protect the life and property of its citizens: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Texas (the house of representatives concurring), That the Honorable George H. Dern, Secretary of War, Washington, D.C., be petitioned to restore and to reestablish this most important military post at Marfa, Tex.; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be sent to the Honorable George H. Dern, Secretary of War, and the Honorable John Nance Garner, Vice President of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, our distinguished friend, the Delegate from Alaska [Mr. DIMOND], who I am sure impressed all of us with the fact that he is going to most ably represent that great Territory, referred to the size of the State of Texas. I represent in area the largest district in the United States. It may be news to some of you new Members, and those of you who have not traveled in Texas, that it is more than 1,000 miles by the meanderings of the river from El Paso, the city where I live, to Brownsville, at the mouth of the Rio Grande.

So that those of you who may not have heard me before upon this subject may know something about the history of this particular transaction, I might say about the War Department what the gentleman from New York [Mr. MEAD] so ably said the other day about the Post Office Department: No economy has been brought about, national defense has been weakened, and, in addition to that, a rank injustice has been done.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON of Texas. Yes.

Mr. GOSS. Was not that a Cavalry post?

Mr. THOMASON of Texas. Yes.

Mr. GOSS. Of course the gentleman is well acquainted with the attitude of the chairman of the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee having in charge the War Department bill toward Cavalry. Is not that one of the reasons that fort was dispensed with?

Mr. THOMASON of Texas. Yes; I think so, and may I say that I am absolutely out of accord with that position.

Mr. GOSS. I am also.

Mr. THOMASON of Texas. I think a majority of the Members of the House are, as would be shown if the House could express itself on questions of legislation affecting national defense.

Mr. MARTIN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON of Texas. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN of Oregon. We had very serious discussions last year about the Army, about maintaining the size of the Army and about the morale of it, and yet all the Members from Texas did not support the Army as you and your friend from Texas [Mr. KLEBERG].

Mr. THOMASON of Texas. I am sure the distinguished general does not include me among those who were against the Army.

Mr. MARTIN of Oregon. No; and that does not include the gentleman sitting beside me [Mr. KLEBERG]. You both proved yourselves to be friends of adequate national defense.

Mr. THOMASON of Texas. I no more speak for all the members of my delegation than does the gentleman speak for all the Members from Oregon. May I say a word or two in order that some of you who may not be acquainted with the facts may know what this situation is? It will be recalled that a good many years ago the noted Pancho Villa, of Mexico, made a raid at Columbus, N.Mex., on our Army. While the Army was asleep in their tents, Villa succeeded in killing a good many American soldiers and citizens, burned the town, stole some Army horses, and escaped back into Mexico. General Pershing chased him a good ways into Mexico, but without success. As I have said before on the floor of this House, I think perhaps that is the blackest page in the history of our great Army. Nevertheless, following the raid, there were other raids along the Texas-Mexican border, and particularly what was known as "Brite ranch", in the Big Bend of Texas, and after the Columbus raid and the Brite-ranch raid and several minor raids the War Department of the United States voluntarily, without solicitation or request on the part of anybody, established a post at Marfa, Tex., and temporarily named it Camp Marfa.

May I say that section of the Texas-Mexico border is a rendezvous for a good many outlaws, both Americans and Mexicans? That post was established and a regiment of Cavalry sent there, but later, realizing the importance and the strategic location of that post, the War Department on December 11, 1928, by general order of the War Department, order No. 20, which appears of record, said:

Camp Marfa announced as a permanent military post and designated as Fort D. A. Russell. Under the provisions of 3 p. A.R. 170-10 the reservation now known as Camp Marfa, Marfa, Tex., is hereby announced as a permanent military post and will on and after January 1, 1930, be designated as Fort D. A. Russell, in honor of Brig. Gen. D. A. Russell, United States Volunteers, who was killed at the Battle of Winchester, September 19, 1864.

I cite that, my friends, so that you may know that by order of the War Department it was then and there made a permanent post of the United States Army. The little town of Marfa, relying upon the good faith of Uncle Sam, paved the roads and streets, built a fine, new, modern hotel, and extended water and sewer lines. After the post was established there was never another raid, never the slightest disturbance along that great stretch of the meandering Rio Grande, but, on the contrary, that regiment of Cavalry at Marfa was a stabilizing influence for friendship between the two countries. The nearest post west was more than 200 miles at El Paso. The nearest post east was about 300 miles.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON] has expired.

Mr. THOMASON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMASON of Texas. Through my relations as a public official in El Paso with the Mexican people, particularly in the city of Juarez and the city of Chihuahua, and to some extent in Mexico City, I found most of their officials to be high-class men who wanted to get along amicably with the people of this country. That post was established at Marfa in order that they might not only protect American lives and property but that they might also build up this spirit of international good will and friendship that ought to exist between the two nations.

Mr. KLEBERG. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. KLEBERG. The gentleman knows that refugees from law and order congregate when they go from this side to the Mexican side of the border, and vice versa, in Mexico those who try to escape the penalties due them there come to this side. The gentleman is aware of the fact that during the location of Fort D. A. Russell, properly equipped with

its Cavalry unit there, much was done to bring law and order to that great strip on the border between Brownsville and El Paso. Now, in that connection I wish the gentleman would give us the benefit of his experience. The gentleman comes from that district and lives there. I have been on the Brite ranch and the other ranches in that neighborhood. Just for the sake of clarifying the situation as to the relative efficiency of a motorized unit as compared with the same number of men on good horses, will the gentleman please give his opinion? How far would a motorized unit get in that territory?

Mr. THOMASON of Texas. A motorized unit in the Big Bend of Texas could not go 1 mile off the highway, and the highways are few and rough. Neither could an airplane land. It takes horses to chase and fight Mexican bandits who are on horses.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Motor trucks would be about as useful as a navy.

Mr. THOMASON of Texas. Not as good as a navy.

Mr. MARTIN of Oregon. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Oregon. Yet this House voted not for a single horse in the Army this year.

Mr. THOMASON of Texas. You and I voted for horses, but the majority did not.

Mr. MARTIN of Oregon. I am glad the gentleman is bringing out these things.

Mr. THOMASON of Texas. May I say to the gentleman from Oregon just how I feel about this? He is a retired major general of the United States Army and knows what an army ought to be. The Military Affairs Committee of the House, in my judgment, is one of the great legislative committees of this House, yet, as the gentleman from Oregon, Mr. MARTIN, and my colleague from Texas, Mr. KLEBERG, and also my other colleague, Judge MANSFIELD, said, in the last session of Congress you saw a certain amount of money taken away from one part of an appropriation bill and added to another, which, in effect, was legislation, for this reason: The House denied a single cent of appropriation to the Cavalry of the United States—that is, for the purchase of additional horses—yet in the very next paragraph of that bill the House appropriated \$435,000 for mechanization, in an effort by some Members of the House completely to mechanize the Army. I say that is a question of policy that involves national defense, and this House should have an opportunity to express itself as to whether or not it wants to do away with cavalry and mechanize the entire Army, when those of us on the Mexican border know that we must have cavalry in order to protect the border. My colleague, Mr. KLEBERG, is a successful rancher on the Mexican border and he knows conditions there. He is a friend of the Army, and I know he agrees with me when I say the removal of those troops was an outrage.

Mr. KLEBERG. Will the gentleman yield for another question?

Mr. THOMASON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. KLEBERG. The gentleman is aware of the fact that the equipment, the housing facilities, the barns, and so forth, at Marfa, Tex., were in good shape when they were abandoned; were they not?

Mr. THOMASON of Texas. Of course they were. There are 180 permanent buildings there, and yet in these days of economic stress they will all be junked unless this Congress stops it.

Mr. KLEBERG. And they represented considerable expense to our Government?

Mr. THOMASON of Texas. Yes; at least a million dollars.

Mr. KLEBERG. The gentleman will also note that that particular section is peculiarly adapted to the perfection of cavalry. It is the finest country on earth for horse raising.

Taking it for granted that cavalry is necessary, my friend will admit that if this country is to be served by this particular branch of national defense it could not be better located than it was at Fort D. A. Russell.

Mr. THOMASON of Texas. There is none better.

Mr. KLEBERG. How much money did it cost?

Mr. THOMASON of Texas. The Government has spent \$1,000,000, and owns 476 acres of land. The people of the town of Marfa will provide additional land if needed. They moved the troops out almost over night, and wrecked or severely injured nearly every business in the town. They were moved to Kentucky, where they were not needed, and at heavy cost. I suppose they are all riding around now in automobiles and shouting for technocracy. In my judgment, this machine age is largely responsible for our present troubles.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. THOMASON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PATMAN). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman find out from the gentleman from Connecticut or the gentleman from Oregon how many horses they now have in the Army and where they are?

Mr. THOMASON of Texas. The records of the Department will show where the horses are. I know there are not enough, to say nothing of the fact that the industry ought to be encouraged. Farmers and stockmen would be benefited.

Mr. HART. We should like to have this information from these gentlemen who have had so much experience with the Army.

Mr. THOMASON of Texas. I cannot give you the exact figures.

Mr. HART. The generals can.

Mr. THOMASON of Texas. The records of the War Department will show how many horses they now have.

As a part of the military policy of this country, hearings should be had before the House Committee on Military Affairs to determine what is best for national defense. If the Army needs cavalry, I do not see why the question of how much cavalry the Army is to have should be determined by the Committee on Appropriations. The units composing the Army as well as the location of permanent posts should be decided by Congress, acting on the recommendation of the Military Affairs Committees of the Senate and House.

Mr. BLANCHARD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON of Texas. Certainly.

Mr. BLANCHARD. Does the gentleman charge the War Department or the Congress with this responsibility?

Mr. THOMASON of Texas. The War Department issued the order. It seems that Congress has not much to do with it. I had a resolution pending in this House, which had been referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and was pending when the removal order was made. All I want is just and fair treatment. I realize there are a lot of Army posts throughout the country that ought to be abandoned, but let the matter be determined by a fair and impartial hearing. In this instance the War Department, at an expense of about \$75,000, moved a regiment of Cavalry from the Mexican border, where it was needed, nearly 2,000 miles inland to Kentucky, where it was not needed.

Within the last 3 days I have read in the newspapers with regret that there are demonstrations in the city of Mexico against our distinguished Ambassador, Hon. Josephus Daniels, who is about to represent us in that country. We want peace and friendship, and one of the best ways to insure it is to preserve law and order along that thousand miles of wild border.

Mr. BLANCHARD. Is there any other place where this arm of our national defense is more needed?

Mr. THOMASON of Texas. No, indeed. If there is anywhere that soldiers are needed in time of peace it is upon the Mexican border. The law-abiding people of Mexico are our friends. Mexico patrols its side of the border. Mexican officials have told me they welcomed our Army along the border. Our Army officers at Fort D. A. Russell engaged frequently in polo games with the Mexican Army officers from Chihuahua. The finest feeling of friendship existed.

Mr. TERRELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. TERRELL. I have two questions to ask of the gentleman from Texas. How much would it cost to motorize this arm of the service; and, is there any place anywhere along the Mexican border that is more in need of this protection than that wild strip of country?

Mr. THOMASON of Texas. It would cost millions of dollars. We have had our raids. I have affidavits in my office stating what the conditions have been since the 1st day of January. I can verify every statement in that resolution passed by the Texas Legislature.

They have taken protection away from these people. It is not right to subject the American citizens living along the Mexican border to the dangers and hazards of outlaws from Mexico. We had our experience at Columbus. We had our experience at the Brite ranch. You cannot tell me that simply to please the whim and fancy of some man who thinks the Army ought to be on wheels the Cavalry should be abandoned. Great army experts the world over have testified to the value of cavalry. The horse has played a big part in every war throughout the centuries. Infantry, artillery, air forces, and motors are necessary, but cavalry is the only force that can operate over rough and wet ground where there are no hard-surfaced roads. Motorized equipment could not operate a mile off the road in the Big Bend of Texas. They are not built to chase bandits who are always on horses themselves.

And so, my friends, I hope as time wears along sentiment will develop in this House to the extent that the Secretary of War and those in charge of our military affairs will see to it that before drastic action of this kind is taken there will be a hearing in the matter and that justice will be done to all parties in interest as well as protection given to American lives and property along the Mexican border. [Applause.] I am not a prophet, but I predict that if soldiers are not returned to Fort D. A. Russell, conditions will grow worse along the Mexican border. I sincerely hope that no American lives will be lost, as happened in previous raids. The Texas Senators and Congressmen expect to ask our new Secretary of War to return those soldiers from Kentucky to Fort D. A. Russell, where they belong and where they are needed. Knowing him to be a just man I have faith that he will do it. I am sure that is the sentiment of the majority of this House, and I want to assure you of my appreciation for the interest you have manifested in the matter. [Applause.]

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes on the Frazier bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, this Nation is in agony; it is hungry; millions are starving in the midst of plenty, in the midst of the so-called "surplus" of food, and yet for some strange reason the hungry cannot get any of this surplus. Unthinking people call it overproduction; reasoning and intelligent people know that the trouble is underconsumption. They know that the law of supply and demand still exists; they know that the supply is here and that the demand is here, but that for some reason the law of supply and demand does not function.

World depression, starving millions, corruption, and misgovernment are today threatening the very foundation of scores of governments, including our own, a situation which arrests our attention and challenges our ingenuity and patriotism. Surely the American people will arise to the occasion and analyze the causes that brought about this condition and then with a determination equivalent to a devotion set about to find a remedy.

What, then, is the cause of this catastrophe that has befallen all the governments since the war? It is caused by the monopolization, not of the wealth of the world but of the medium of exchange, the monopolization in the hands of a few financial monarchs of the money of the

world. This was brought about by a skillful manipulation of the currency of the various nations, by monopolistic tariffs, by gambling in stocks and bonds and the necessities of life, and by the ill-considered, revengeful, and ignorant reparation policy following the war.

In our own country it was brought about, first, by virtually doubling the money in circulation and then by a cruel, brutal, and inhuman deflation, by virtually cutting the money in circulation in two.

When we entered the World War our financiers had already bet on the wrong horse over in Europe to the extent of billions of dollars—they had given the Allied Governments credit for war materials, food, and clothing to that extent. President Wilson realized that in order to win the war, the Government—in other words, the people of this Nation—you men and women—would have to assume that indebtedness for which our financiers had given credit in the way of war materials, food, and clothing to the Allied Governments. That is how our foreign indebtedness arose. Our Government never loaned a dollar directly to the Allied Governments. It merely gave them credit, and the international bankers manipulated that credit in such a way that they got billions of dollars out of the \$22,000,000,000 of Liberty bonds we bought, and the United States Government, which means us, was substituted as the creditor of the Allied Governments in place of the international racketeers that had bet on the wrong horse. If these international gamblers had not bet on the wrong horse to that extent, this Government never would have gotten into the World War. It would have been over before we got started.

President Wilson knew that in order to win the war our Government would have to sell billions of dollars of bonds. He knew that there was not enough money in circulation among the people to enable them to buy these bonds, so he suggested to the heads of the Federal Reserve bank that they increase the money by issuing Federal Reserve notes and put them in circulation among the people.

Thereupon the local banks throughout this Nation took your note and my note and Tom, Dick, and Harry's note, stamped on the back of them "Payment guaranteed", put them in a nice bundle, sent them to a Federal Reserve bank, and received Federal Reserve notes, dollar for dollar, in exchange.

At the time we entered the war there was in circulation in the United States approximately \$4,000,000,000. It is estimated that 1 billion of this was in foreign nations, that another 500 million has been lost since the Government began to make money some 156 years ago, lost in the fields, destroyed in homes and buildings that have burned, leaving about 2½ billion dollars in actual circulation. This was increased during the war to approximately \$5,700,000,000. In round numbers, the increase or inflation was approximately \$2,000,000,000—the circulating medium, money actually in the United States, was more than doubled by the issuing of Federal Reserve notes.

With this additional money, with this extra \$2,000,000,000 as a revolving fund, we bought billions of dollars of Liberty bonds, bought new farms, new homes, and made countless improvements. There was plenty of money with which to measure the muscular and brain energy of our people. Prosperity was almost universal in this land of ours, and we had the highest standard of living of any nation.

But disaster was awaiting us. In 1920, while Woodrow Wilson was a sick man, the international bankers stole the Federal Reserve bank. Suddenly and without warning, the Federal Reserve bank began its deflation policy. It suddenly and without warning called upon your local bank, my local bank, and Tom, Dick, and Harry's local bank throughout this Nation to pay those notes they had guaranteed. It was at that time that your local bank was compelled to call upon Tom, Dick, and Harry to pay those notes it had guaranteed, and it was at that time that the prosperity of this Nation was wrecked.

It was at that time that the price of the farmer's wheat went down from 2 and 3 dollars a bushel to 80 cents;

it was at that time that the farmer's steers went down from \$125 apiece to \$25. By the end of 1921 the Federal Reserve bank had called in approximately a billion dollars of the Federal Reserve notes that it had issued in exchange for your note, my note, and Tom, Dick, and Harry's note.

The first industry to feel the effects of this deflation was American agriculture. The farmer, being unorganized, was the first to fall victim to the deflation. He was virtually slaughtered. He was made the shock absorber of deflation, and had he been able to carry the burden, the entire cost of the war would have been thrown upon his shoulders. But, as usual, greed knew no limit; the load it placed upon the farmer became intolerable, and he broke down under it.

Most of the farm indebtedness was created during the World War, during the period of inflation when there was plenty of money to measure the muscular and brain energy of our people, when everybody was at work, and when prices were high. Before the price-fixing act became effective, and prior to deflation, the farmers were getting as high as \$3.89 per bushel for No. 1 Dark Northern wheat in Minneapolis, and other agricultural products were selling accordingly. At that time a thousand bushels of wheat would have paid an indebtedness of \$3,890. Today 1,000,000, 2,000,000, or 3,000,000 bushels of wheat will not pay that same indebtedness, because the farmers are selling it far below the cost of production. What is true of wheat is true of practically all agricultural products. The selling price of practically all agricultural products since 1922 has been below the cost of production.

As a result, one may start from the Canadian line in the State of North Dakota and travel south to the Gulf of Mexico, crossing the States of North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, Oklahoma, and Texas, and all along the line he will see deserted farm homes, broken fences, tumbled-down barns, unpainted houses in sad need of repairs—the very surroundings bespeak poverty and despair where once there was prosperity, hope, and plenty. He will learn of hundreds and thousands of mortgage foreclosures, past and pending. He will meet hundreds of thousands of fathers and mothers whose sons and daughters have gone into the already overcrowded cities. He will hear from their lips that before the period of deflation they were worth from \$25,000 to \$50,000, happy, prosperous, and contented, and now have either become tenants or are about to be evicted, with no place to go.

Such a condition affects not only the farmers but the Nation as a whole. It is a national calamity; it is a disgrace to the twentieth century and can only be explained by a complete breakdown—no; by a complete bankruptcy—of political and economical leadership. We have an overproduction of just one thing in the United States, and that is an overproduction, a superabundance, of ignorance on fundamental issues. We have heard of short selling, but one thing is sure—as a nation in this depression we are long on short thinking.

We have at our fingers' tips all that is necessary to bring about the greatest prosperity and happiness that this Nation has ever seen. We have too much to eat, so much that one half the farmers of this Nation have lost their homes and the other half are about to lose them in producing it. Again, we have so much raw material of every kind and description that we do not know what to do with it, and yet we have millions and millions and billions of human wants. There is hardly a man, woman, or child in this land that does not need some new clothing or other necessities, and then there are 15,000 men and women out of employment who are eager and willing to take this raw material and make it into finished products for us, and yet the great American engine is stalling.

Then what is the trouble in this Nation? The trouble is we have not enough money in actual circulation to measure the muscle and brain energy of our people, and we have done nothing in this Congress up to this time to remedy the situation.

Oh, yes; some of my friends have said we have just inflated the currency. Yes; we have just printed two billions

of paper money in addition to the four billions of Federal Reserve notes and given it to the banks of this Nation, but that is not inflation.

Mr. PATMAN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. LEMKE. Certainly.

Mr. PATMAN. I presume the gentleman knows that the banks have refused to take this \$2,000,000,000 that was printed for them because they are required by the Government to pay one half of 1 percent annual tax on it; and since the banks have refused to take it and have only used \$9,000,000 of it, does not the gentleman think the Government should use this \$2,000,000,000 for another purpose that would put it in circulation all over the country?

Mr. LEMKE. It should, absolutely; and that brings me to the Frazier bill and the Patman bill that I am going to explain here if I get the time to do it.

Mr. McFADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEMKE. Yes.

Mr. McFADDEN. In connection with what the gentleman has just stated, the gentleman is aware of the fact that the Federal Reserve retired over \$500,000,000 of Federal Reserve notes last week.

Mr. LEMKE. I am, and will state that all that we have had has been deflation. There can be no inflation unless the money is distributed among the people. If the Government printed \$100,000,000,000 and gave it to me, and I put it in my pocket and kept it there, there would be no inflation. If we want inflation, we must put the money—the medium of exchange—in the hands of the people so that they can use it and spend it.

I now come to the Frazier bill. I am told that during the last campaign, someone asked our friend Raskob what he thought of the Frazier bill, and he got very much excited and said, "Hell, I thought that bill was paid," but it has not been paid; it is yet to be paid. The Frazier farm relief bill provides that the United States Government shall refinance the existing farm indebtedness at 1½ percent interest and 1½ per cent principal on the amortization plan, not by issuing bonds, but by issuing Federal Reserve notes, secured by first mortgages on farms—the best security on earth—better than foreign bonds, and far better than the security put up for Federal Reserve notes by the international bankers and Wall Street, for whose benefit the Federal Reserve bank has been functioning ever since they kidnaped it. This bill asks the Government to do for the farmer what it is doing for the large banks, insurance, and railroad companies through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

When this bill becomes a law it will put from two to three billion dollars new money in circulation among the people; it will loosen the frozen assets; the unemployed will again be able to get work and eat; the price of agricultural products will go up; the starving of millions will end; business will again be general. Even at 1½ percent interest, if the Government will refinance the entire farm indebtedness, it will make a gross profit of over \$6,345,000,000 out of the transaction in 47 years.

Nineteen State legislatures have memorialized Congress requesting and demanding that it pass the Frazier bill without delay. They are Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Iowa, Illinois, Indiana, Minnesota, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Dakota, Tennessee, Wisconsin, Kansas, and South Carolina.

Give us the Frazier bill—the Patman bill, pay the soldiers their compensation in cash, not by issuing bonds, but by issuing full legal-tender Treasury notes—give us the Swank bill, guaranteeing the farmer the cost of production for that part of his products which is consumed or used within the United States—give us the Wheeler bill, remonetize silver. Give us these four bills, the Frazier bill, the Patman bill, the Swank bill, the Wheeler bill, and then we can go home and in less than 3 months you will not have to feed any starving people. There will be enough money in circulation, units of exchange to measure the muscular and brain energy of our people. We will have fulfilled our campaign and platform pledges, and we will have met the demands, the hopes, and

the aspirations of the people of this Nation—not only of the farmers but of all the men and women of this Nation—and unless we do this permit me to suggest that there will be a sad disappointment. The conditions are getting worse, not better. The time has come for intelligent action—the time has come for courage. Let us forget the bygone days of legislating for the bankers only and legislate for all the people of the United States of America.

I shall not take any more of your time. I thank you. [Applause.]

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order there is not a quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman withhold that a moment?

Mr. GOSS. I withhold it, Mr. Speaker.

RESIGNATIONS

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

The Hon. HENRY T. RAINEY,

Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I have been advised by the Honorable R. L. DOUGHTON, chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, that I have been designated a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

As this appointment necessitates my resigning from the Committees on Census, Education, Elections No. 1, and Roads, I hereby tender my resignation as a member of the last-named committees and respectfully ask that my resignations be accepted.

Sincerely yours,

MARTIN A. BRENNAN.

The resignation was accepted.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the following communication:

Hon. HENRY T. RAINEY,

The Speaker House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Due to the enormous amount of work as chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia, as well as my duties on the Labor Committee, I find it impossible to give the required time to the Committee on World War Legislation, which time I gave freely and with a great deal of pleasure and satisfaction during the past several years.

For this reason, as well as the fact that there are many new Members of Congress who are desirous of being named on this committee who could give their full time to this worthy cause, I regretfully tender my resignation, to take effect at once.

In tendering my resignation to you, I should like to express my appreciation of the treatment I have been accorded during my 8 years of service on the Committee on World War Legislation.

Very sincerely yours,

MARY T. NORTON.

The resignation was accepted.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the following communication:

Hon. HENRY T. RAINEY,

Speaker House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby resign from the Committee on Mines and Mining and the Committee on War Claims.

Very truly yours,

FRANK GILLESPIE.

The resignation was accepted.

JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. PARSONS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J.Res. 121. To provide for the acceptance of sums donated for the construction of a swimming-exercise tank for the use of the President.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. COOPER of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 12 minutes p.m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until Monday, April 3, 1933, at 12 o'clock noon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. McREYNOLDS: Committee on Foreign Affairs. House Joint Resolution 93. Joint resolution to prohibit the

exportation of arms or munitions of war from the United States under certain conditions; without amendment (Rept. No. 22). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COOPER of Ohio: A bill (H.R. 4491) granting the consent of Congress to the Board of County Commissioners of Mahoning County, Ohio, to construct a free overhead viaduct across the Mahoning River at Struthers, Mahoning County, Ohio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SIROVICH: A bill (H.R. 4492) amending the Civil Service Retirement Act; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. EDMONDS: A bill (H.R. 4493) to prevent discrimination against American ships and ports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOILEAU: A bill (H.R. 4494) authorizing a per capita payment of \$100 to the members of the Menominee Tribe of Indians of Wisconsin from funds on deposit to their credit in the Treasury of the United States; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. HARLAN: A bill (H.R. 4495) to repeal, as obsolete, Revised Statutes 1132, as amended; to the Committee on Revision of the Laws.

By Mr. BURKE of California: A bill (H.R. 4496) to regulate commerce between the United States and foreign countries in crude petroleum and fuel oil and all distillates obtained from petroleum, including kerosene, benzene, naphtha, gasoline, paraffin, and paraffin oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURNHAM: A bill (H.R. 4497) establishing a naval record for certain officers and enlisted men of the Naval Militia of California who performed active duty on the U.S.S. *Marion* or *Pinta* during the War with Spain; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MEAD: A bill (H.R. 4498) to authorize the delivery of surplus forfeited vessels of the Treasury Department to the Boy Scouts of America for use in sea-scout training; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McLEOD: A bill (H.R. 4499) to confer additional jurisdiction on the United States Board of Tax Appeals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOTT: A bill (H.R. 4500) to regulate the sale of securities in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DOCKWEILER: A bill (H.R. 4501) to regulate commerce between the United States and foreign countries in crude petroleum and fuel oil and all distillates obtained from petroleum, including kerosene, benzene, naphtha, gasoline, paraffin, and paraffin oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H.R. 4502) to regulate commerce between the United States and foreign countries in crude petroleum and fuel oil and all distillates obtained from petroleum, including kerosene, benzene, naphtha, gasoline, paraffin, and paraffin oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DISNEY: A bill (H.R. 4503) to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear and determine certain claims of the Pawnee Indians against the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. BUCHANAN: A bill (H.R. 4504) to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to assist in effecting voluntary reduction in farm mortgages and readjustment of farm-mortgage terms and conditions; to cooperate with the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration and other Government agencies in refinancing farm-mortgage indebtedness, delinquent interest, and tax payments; and to provide facilities for refinancing such indebtedness; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. O'MALLEY: Joint resolution (H.J.Res. 137) relating to the creation of a joint committee for the investigation of the activities of mortgage, bond, debenture, shareholder, and insolvency committees, and to authorize the

Secretary of the Treasury to prescribe regulations for the liquidation of assets and the reorganization of enterprises through the reissuance of bonds, stocks, and notes on re-liquidated assets; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. McFADDEN: Concurrent resolution (H.Con.Res. 12) to make an audit of the Treasury Department; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, concurrent resolution (H.Con.Res. 13) to authorize expenses of House Concurrent Resolution 12, to make an audit of the Treasury Department; to the Committee on Accounts.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. GAVAGAN: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, urging that the United States, through its Department of State, use its best efforts to persuade the German Government to desist against any further outrages and persecutions against Jews; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLOOM: A bill (H.R. 4505) for the relief of the Washington Beef Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BURKE of California: A bill (H.R. 4506) granting an increase of pension to Eleanor Ady; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H.R. 4507) for the relief of Bogustas De Kartowski; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H.R. 4508) for the relief of Thomas Francis Burke; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H.R. 4509) for the relief of George Henry Clayberger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H.R. 4510) granting a pension to Emma C. Relf; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H.R. 4511) for the relief of Seymour H. Dotson, otherwise known as William Dodson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H.R. 4512) granting a pension to Harry C. Spring; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURNHAM: A bill (H.R. 4513) for the relief of George Bingham; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H.R. 4514) for the relief of Rossetta Laws; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CANNON of Wisconsin: A bill (H.R. 4515) for the relief of Peter Karampelis; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. COOPER of Ohio: A bill (H.R. 4516) for the relief of B. Edward Westwood; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DISNEY: A bill (H.R. 4517) for the relief of Jim German; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H.R. 4518) for the relief of James C. Bearskin; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H.R. 4519) for the relief of C. W. Moonery; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H.R. 4520) for the relief of Walter P. Hagen; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FORD: A bill (H.R. 4521) for the relief of Edwin Senior; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H.R. 4522) for the relief of Arthur L. Hawtrey; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H.R. 4523) for the relief of Sam B. Lewis; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H.R. 4524) for the relief of Carl Siele; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H.R. 4525) for the relief of Bernard Gallagher; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H.R. 4526) for the relief of George F. Campbell; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H.R. 4527) granting a pension to Mary A. Thomas; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HASTINGS: A bill (H.R. 4528) for the relief of Cooper E. Davis; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HENNEY: A bill (H.R. 4529) granting an increase of pension to Jennie C. Brewster; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOEPEL: A bill (H.R. 4530) granting a pension to Ricketts J. Oder; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JONES: A bill (H.R. 4531) for the relief of Dan King; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KLEBERG: A bill (H.R. 4532) for the relief of William H. Little; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LUCE: A bill (H.R. 4533) to reimburse D. W. Tanner for expense of purchasing an artificial limb; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McCLINTIC: A bill (H.R. 4534) granting a pension to Charley W. Lanford; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McFADDEN: A bill (H.R. 4535) for the relief of Wilfred J. Drey; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McLEOD: A bill (H.R. 4536) granting an increase of pension to Gustav F. Breiter; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PARKER of New York: A bill (H.R. 4537) for the relief of Ettie A. Shepard; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RAMSPECK: A bill (H.R. 4538) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to appoint Master Sgt. Elmer Edward Wilson a warrant officer of the Regular Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H.R. 4539) granting a pension to Lilla Tarpley Bright; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H.R. 4540) granting a pension to Berta Herbert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H.R. 4541) for the relief of George Dacas; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H.R. 4542) for the relief of Frank Wilkins; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SHALLENBERGER: A bill (H.R. 4543) granting an increase of pension to Julia A. Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

251. By Mr. ANDREW of Massachusetts: Petition adopted by the Massachusetts Legislature, urging the enactment of appropriate legislation providing for the labeling of goods imported into the United States for sale therein, in such manner as to apprise the purchaser and consumer of the place of origin of such goods; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

252. By Mr. ARENS: Petition of Joseph Veilleux, North Como Improvement and Protective Association, North Chatsworth and Hoyt Streets, St. Paul, Minn., petitioning the Government to provide financial means of saving our homes from confiscation through foreclosure of mortgages; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

253. Also, petition of Elmer F. Hillner, district commander, American Legion, Minneapolis, Minn., requesting that the President and Congress be respectfully asked to withhold passage of the said economy bill so that national committees of veterans' organizations shall have an opportunity to avail Congress of their advice and counsel in the preparation of a new bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

254. Also, petition of Gust Hallberg, Wheaton Cooperative Association, of Wheaton, Minn., favoring a law that will make tariff effective on farm products, condemning the action of packers, milling interests, and textile-mill operators for their efforts against the allotment plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

255. Also, petition of E. J. Harrell, secretary Central Council of District Clubs, St. Paul, Minn., concerning the remonetization of silver; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

256. Also, petition of F. C. Marpe, commander, and certain members of the Leo Carey Post, No. 56, American Legion, of Albert Lea, Minn., opposing the construction of the post-office building in the city of Albert Lea, and requesting that the postmastership of Albert Lea be discontinued; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

257. Also, petition of Albert E. Bickford, city clerk of the city of Virginia, county of St. Louis, State of Minnesota, and the mayor and city council of the city, speaking for citizens of the city, heartily endorsing and approving President Roosevelt's reforestation project, especially as it relates to the development of the Superior National Forest; to the Committee on Labor.

258. Also, petition of John Kobi, secretary, 208 South Sixty-second Avenue West, Duluth Minn., requesting Congress to investigate the war price of coal in the region of the Head of the Lakes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

259. By Mr. CARTER of Wyoming: Memorial of Local Union 1307, United Mine Workers of America, Elkol, Wyo.; to the Committee on Labor.

260. By Mr. CONNOLLY: Petition of renderers located in Philadelphia, Pa., and vicinity, praying for a duty of 5 cents per pound on all imports of animal, marine, and vegetable oils and fats and upon the oil content of imported raw materials from which such oils are processed in the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

261. By Mr. FITZPATRICK: Petition of the Jewish citizens of Bronx County, protesting against the hostile and uncivilized policies, and to the general denunciation by all who hold human brotherhood sacred, of the occurrences recently affecting the Jews of Germany; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

262. By Mr. GAVAGAN: Petition of Dyckman Street Business Men's Association, urging that Congress do all in its power to assure fair and equal treatment of all persons insofar as the people of Germany are concerned; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

263. By Mr. HOLMES: Resolution of the members of the ward assembly, Worcester, Mass.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

264. By Mr. JOHNSON of Minnesota: Petition of the Duluth, Winnipeg, and Pacific System Federation, No. 148, Duluth, Minn., concerning the high price of coal at the Head of the Lakes region, unemployment insurance, tax-exempt securities (tax on), and revising the tariff law between the United States and Canada; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

265. Also, petition of E. J. Harrel, secretary the Central Council of District Clubs, St. Paul, Minn., concerning the remonetization of silver; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

266. Also, petition of J. H. Biesiot, clerk, township of Potamo, Lake of the Woods County, Minn., opposing the settlement of the European debt and unloading of these debts upon American labor and farmers, abolition of privilege in finance, repeal of certain charters of certain national banks, and invoking of the Federal Constitution which provides for Congress to coin money and regulate the value thereof; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

267. Also, a resolution by the local club of the Socialist Party of America, Askov, Minn.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

268. By Mr. LINDSAY: Petition of Robert Gair Co., Inc., New York City, urging the passage of House bills 3754 and 3755; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

269. Also, petition of Society of Park Engineers of New York, Brooklyn, N.Y., urging support of Senate bill 5609, introduced by Senator WAGNER; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

270. Also, petition of Amalgamated Paint Co., New York City, favoring the passage of House bill 235, the Shannon bill; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

271. By Mr. REID of Illinois: A resolution adopted at a mass meeting held at Aurora, of citizens of Aurora, Joliet, and Elgin, Ill., protesting against reported abuses and discriminations shown against German Jewish citizens, and urging that the Government of the United States should exert its power and influence to discourage and prevent by all lawful means possible a further continuance of such cruel

and inhuman acts unjustly committed against the people of the Jewish faith now residing in Germany; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

272. By Mr. RUDD: Petition of Amalgamated Paint Co., New York City, opposing the manufacture of paint and varnish in Government-owned navy yards; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

273. Also, petition of Robert Gair Co., Inc., New York City, favoring the passage of House bill 3754, providing for the repeal of section 15-A of the Interstate Commerce Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

274. By Mr. SUTPHIN: Petition of Tecumseh Tribe, No. 60, Improved Order of Red Men, Asbury Park, N.J., pledging whole-hearted support to our President, Franklin D. Roosevelt; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

275. By Mr. WILLFORD: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Iowa, favoring the passage of Senate bill 1197, for the liquidating and refinancing of agricultural indebtedness and providing for a reduced rate of interest for the same through the Federal farm loan system and the Federal Reserve Bank System; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

276. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Iowa, requesting the Iowa Representatives in Congress to uphold the President of the United States in action proposed by him for the solution of this emergency, particularly with regard to those measures which may apply to or affect agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture.

277. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Iowa, favoring legislation tending to promote and develop the production of grain or ethyl alcohol to be used as a blend with petroleum products for motor-vehicle fuel, and then an import duty be placed on blackstrap molasses entering the United States, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

278. By Mr. WITHROW: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, relating to the importance of maintaining and developing the work of the United States Forest Products Laboratory; to the Committee on Labor.

SENATE

FRIDAY, MARCH 31, 1933

(Legislative day of Monday, Mar. 13, 1933)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

BRONSON CUTTING, a Senator from the State of New Mexico, appeared in his seat today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate will receive a message from the President of the United States.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States, submitting several nominations, were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, who announced that on March 28, 1933, the President approved and signed the following acts:

- S. 148. An act for the relief of Agnes M. Angle;
- S. 149. An act for the relief of Daisy Anderson;
- S. 150. An act for the relief of W. H. Hendrickson; and
- S. 155. An act for the relief of A. Y. Martin.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, I note the absence of a quorum, and I move a roll call.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Bulkley	Costigan	George
Ashurst	Bulow	Couzens	Gore
Austin	Byrd	Cutting	Hale
Bachman	Byrnes	Dickinson	Harrison
Bailey	Capper	Dieterich	Hatfield
Bankhead	Caraway	Dill	Hayden
Barbour	Carey	Duffy	Hebert
Barkley	Clark	Erickson	Johnson
Black	Connally	Fess	Kean
Bone	Coolidge	Fletcher	Kendrick
Borah	Copeland	Frazier	Keyes

King
La Follette
Lewis
Logan
Loneragan
Long
McAdoo
McCarran
McGill
McKellar

McNary
Murphy
Neely
Norris
Nye
Overton
Patterson
Pittman
Pope
Reynolds

Robinson, Ark.
Robinson, Ind.
Russell
Schall
Sheppard
Shipstead
Smith
Steiwer
Stephens
Thomas, Okla.

Thomas, Utah
Trammell
Tydings
Vandenberg
Van Nuys
Wagner
Walcott
Walsh
Wheeler
White

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, may I announce the necessary absence of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. BRATTON] and of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BROWN]. The announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. BYRD. I wish to announce that my colleague the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is necessarily detained from the Senate.

Mr. HEBERT. I desire to announce that the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] is still detained from the Senate by illness.

I also wish to announce the necessary absence of the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED], the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. DALE], the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. HASTINGS], and the junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. TOWNSEND].

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-four Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the approval of the Journal for the calendar days of Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday, March 28, 29, and 30, 1933.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following joint memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, which was referred to the Committee on Finance:

Senate Joint Memorial 1 (by Mr. Walker)

IN THE LEGISLATURE OF THE TERRITORY OF ALASKA, ELEVENTH SESSION.

To the honorable the Congress of the United States:

Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in regular session assembled, respectfully reports that—

Whereas the inhabitants of the coastal regions of southeastern and southwestern Alaska have heretofore derived their livelihood almost solely from the taking and selling of salmon and halibut and the manufacture of fish products; and

Whereas the inhabitants of this region are suffering from severe adverse economic conditions to such an extent that want and destitution are common; and

Whereas the care and sustenance of the destitute and needy inhabitants of said regions has and is placing a staggering burden on the Territory of Alaska, the municipal governments, and the property owners of said region; and

Whereas want and destitution are particularly prevalent among the native wards of the United States inhabiting said regions; and

Whereas this condition of want and suffering is traceable directly to the unstable condition of the salmon- and halibut-fishing industry in said region; and

Whereas said industry is practically paralyzed and unable to operate, thereby creating unemployment among those dependent upon it; and

Whereas the chaotic condition of said halibut and salmon industry has been created by the demoralization of its market by reason of the importation of halibut and salmon products from foreign countries, now off the gold standard and whose currencies are greatly depreciated on the foreign exchange; and

Whereas by reason of such depreciated currencies Japanese importers can sell pink salmon at greatly reduced prices on the American market and realize a substantial profit from their operation, due to the fact that the value of the American funds received in payment of their product is greatly enhanced in Japan because of the great depreciation of Japanese currency; and

Whereas producers of canned salmon in the Territory of Alaska by use of the most modern methods and by payment of a low and insufficient wage scale and an extremely low and insufficient price for the raw product, have been placing their product on the wholesale market at a price below the cost of production; which said price leaves no margin or profit, and in some instances results in a substantial operating deficit, even when fixed charges such as interest payments, depreciation, etc., are disregarded; and

Whereas this same situation exists with reference to the halibut industry, Alaskan halibut fishermen being thrown in direct competition with Canadian halibut fishermen, who outfit their vessels and maintain their homes in the Province of British Columbia, where Canadian currency is accepted at face value and has a purchasing power equal to or greater than American currency expended in the Territory of Alaska; and